SHOUT
SHARE
IT

ZS 2702

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	1
Special Announcements	2
Financial Report for 1981	4
Commission Report: General Meeting, Ottawa, Canada, 23–27 August, 1982	7
Anolis Daudin, 1802 (Reptilia). C.W. Sabrosky; A.F. Stimson & G. Underwood	15
Attus otiosus Hentz, 1846 (Araneae, Salticidae). B. Cutler	19
Gorgonia flabelliformis Eichwald, 1840 (Graptolithina), Ph. Legrand; D. Skevington	19
Opinion 1239. *Attelabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Coleoptera)	25
Opinion 1240, HESPERIIDAE Latreille, 1809 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)	27
Opinion 1241. CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898 and PALAEOTHENTIDAE Sinclair, 1906 (Mammalia)	29
Opinion 1242. *Cataphryxus* Shiino, 1936 (Crustacea, Isopoda)	33
Opinion 1243. *Erinaceus dauuricus* Sundevall, 1842 (Mammalia, Insectivora)	35
Opinion 1244. *Stethaspis* Hope, 1837 (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae)	37
Opinion 1245. *Linyphia tenebricola* Wider, 1834 (Arachnida)	39
Pseudopontia Plötz *v. Gonophlebia* Felder (Insecta, Lepidoptera). C.F. Cowan	41
Family-groups based on *Myrmecia* (Insecta) and *Myrmecium* (Arachnida). J. Reiskind	43
Family group names based on *Eurhin, Eurhinus* and *Eurhynchus* (Coleoptera). E.C. Zimmerman; R.T. Thompson	45
Myzus festucae Theobald, 1917 (Insecta, Aphidoidea). H.L.G. Stroyan	53
Dactylopusia Norman, 1903 (Crustacea, Copepoda). W. Vervoort & L.B. Holthuis	56
ANUROPODIDAE in Crustacea Isopoda and in Crustacea Tanaidacea. M. Bacescu, J. Sieg & L.B. Holthuis	58
Calaphis Walsh, 1862 and *Callaphis* Walker, 1870 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Aphididae). F.W. Quednau	60
UROPLAT — as the stem of family-group names in Amphibia and Insecta (Coleoptera). H.M. Smith & U.N. Lanham	62
Oeciacus vicarius Horváth, 1912 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Cimicidae). R.C. Froeschner, E.V. Coan & R.E. Ryckman	65
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	67
Special Announcements	68
Comment on *Chuangia* Walcott, 1911 and *Shantungia* Walcott, 1905. C. Lochman Balk & C.J. Stubblefield	70
Comment on *Aphytis mytilaspidis* Le Baron, 1870. A.D. Austin, B. Bolton, Z. Boucek, N.D.M. Ferguson, M.G. Fitton, L.D. Gauld, T. Huddleston, J.S. Noyes, J. Quinlan & B.R. Subba Rao	70
Comment on *Kinosternon alamose & K. oaxacae* Pritchard. 1979. The Secretary	71

Comments on Rasnitsyn's proposal to regulate the names of taxa above the family group. D.J. Brothers 72
Comments on *Galeopsomyia* Girault, 1916. L.B. Holthuis; J. LaSalle & P. DeBach 73
Opinion 1246. *Herpetodryas margaritiferus* Schlegel, 1837 (Reptilia, Septentes) 75
Opinion 1247. *Dactylopius* Costa, (Nov. 1829) and *Pseudococcus* Westwood, 1840 (Insecta, Homoptera) 77
Opinion 1248. *Lethocerus* Mayr, 1853 (Insecta, Hemiptera) . . . 81
Opinion 1249. *Toxostoma crissale* Baird, 1858 (Aves) 83
Opinion 1250. *Gyrohypnus* Samouelle, 1819; *Zantholinus* Dejean, 1821; *Othius* Stephens, 1829 (Insecta, Coleoptera) 85
Opinion 1251. *Dicranodonta* Woods, 1899 (Bivalvia, Cucullaeidae) . 88
Opinion 1252. *Sterna cerulea* Bennett, 1840 (Aves) 90
Opinion 1253. *Chromodoris californiensis* Bergh, 10 May 1879 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) 92
Opinion 1254. *Prohysteroceras* Spath, 1921 and *Neokentroceras* Spath, 1921 (Cephalopoda, Ammonoidea) 94
Opinion 1255. *Lespesia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863 (Diptera, Tachinidae) 97
Larentia capitata Herrich-Schäffer, 1839 and *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). K. Mikkola 102
Mya Rondani, 1850 and *Somomya* Bertolini, 1861 (Insecta, Diptera). A.C. Pont 106
Ancistroceroides Saussure, 1855 (Hymenoptera, Vespoidea, Eumenidae). J. van der Vecht 111
Kassina Girard 1853 (Amphibia, Anura). A. Dubois & J.-J. Morère and A.F. Stimson & B.T. Clarke 114
Simia fascicularis Raffles, 1821 (Mammalia, Primates). P.H. Napier & C.P. Groves 117
Allygus Fieber, 1872 (Insecta, Homoptera). F. Ossiannilsson . . 119
Mactra sachalinensis Schrenk, 1862 (Mollusca, Bivalvia). A.I. Kafanov 122
CAECILIIDAE in Amphibia and Insecta (Psocoptera). T.E. Moore, R.A. Nussbaum & E.L. Mockford 124
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology . . . 129
Special Announcements 130
Address by Professor T.R.E. Southwood, F.R.S., Vice-President, The Royal Society 133
Financial Report for 1982 137
Nomenclature of Organisms considered by some to be animals and by others plants or bacteria (W.D.L. Ride) 140
Opinion 1256. *Sorex dsinezumi* Temminck, 1843 (Mammalia, Insectivora) 147
Opinion 1257. *Tipula ferruginea* Fabricius, 1805 (Insecta, Diptera) 149
Opinion 1258. *Ochthera exculpta* Loew, 1862 (Insecta, Diptera) . 151
Opinion 1259. *Ogygiocaris* Angelin, 1854 and *Ogygites* Tromelin & Lebesconte, 1876 (Trilobita) 153
Opinion 1260. *Orthunga* Dohrn, 1859 (Insecta, Hemiptera) . . . 157
Opinion 1261. *Chuangia* Walcott, 1911 and *Shantungia* Walcott, 1905 (Trilobita) 160

Astacilla Cordiner, 1793 (Crustacea, Isopoda). B. Kensely . . . 163
Hyla femoralis chrysoscelis Cope, 1880 (Amphibia, Anura). H.M. Smith, K.T. Fitzgerald & L.J. Guillette, Jr. 165
Bagrus Bosc, 1816 (Pisces, Siluriformes). R.M. Bailey & D.J. Stewart) 167
Neadmete Habe, 1961 (Gastropoda). R.E. Petit 173
Calymene Brongniart, 1822 (Trilobita). H.B. Whittington . . . 176
Panopea Ménard de la Groye, April 1807 (Mollusca, Bivalvia). The Secretary 179
Pachycephalosaurus Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943 and *Troodon wyomingensis* Gilmore, 1931 (Reptilia, Dinosauria): proposed conservation. D. Baird 184
Donax hanleyanus Philippi, 1847 (Mollusca, Bivalvia). W. Narchi . 188
Dromophis Peters, 1869 (Reptilia, Serpentes): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. D.G. Broadley 189
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology . . . 191
Special Announcements 193
Comment on *Anolis* Daudin, 1802. J.M. Savage; A.F. Stimson & G.L. Underwood 195
Comment on TEIIDAE Gray, 1827. A.F. Stimson; L.B. Holthuis . 196
Comment on *Dendrobates* Wagler, 1830 and DENDROBATIDAE Cope, 1865. L.B. Holthuis; A. Dubois 197
Opinion 1262. *Cancer vocans major* Herbst, 1782 (Crustacea, Decapoda) 200
Opinion 1263. *Prototomus viverrinus* Cope, 1874 (Mammalia) . . 202
Caeparia Stål, 1877 (Insecta, Dictyoptera). L.M. Roth & A.B. Gurney 205
Megilla Fabricius, 1805 and *Macropis* Klug, 1809 (Hymenoptera, Apoidea). C.D. Michener 207
Boiga Fitzinger, 1826 (Reptilia, Serpentes). J.B. Rasmussen & A.F. Stimson 209
Glossodoris Ehrenberg, 1831, *Hypselodoris* Stimpson, 1855 and *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855 (Gastropoda, Opisthobranchia). W.B. Rudman 211
Rhinoclama Dall & Smith, 1886 (Mollusca, Septibranchia). D. Heppell 221
Chelydra osceola Stejneger, 1918 (Reptilia, Testudines). H.M. Smith, R.B. Smith & D. Chiszar 225
Bainella Rennie, 1930 (Arthropoda, Trilobita). M.R. Cooper . . 228
Crinodes Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 and *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). D.S. Fletcher & I.W.B. Nye 231
NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916 (Gastropoda). D. Heppell 237
Tricelia variopedata Renier, [1807] (Polychaeta). The Secretary . 241
Euphraedra Hübner, [1819] (Insecta, Lepidoptera). C.F. Cowan . 243
Ourocnemis Baker, 1887 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). C.F. Cowan . . 245
Ceroplesis Serville, 1835 (Insecta, Coleoptera). R.C. Marinoni . . 248
Rallus tabuensis Gmelin, 1789 (Aves). N.D. Bruce, D.T. Holyoak & J.-C. Thibault 249
Zeugophora Kunze, 1818 (Insecta, Coleoptera). H. Silfverberg . . 252
Index to Authors 255
List of Decisions in this volume 256
Names placed on Official Lists and Indexes in Decisions published in volume 40 257

Index to Key Names 259
Corrigenda 266
Particulars of dates of publication of the several parts in which the present volume was published 266
Instructions to Binder 266

S 2182

March 1983 Volume 40 Part 1
pp. i–ii, 1–66
ISSN 0007-5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

BRITISH MUSEUM NAT. HIST. 11 APR 1983 PURCHASED ZOOLOGY LIBRARY

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD

Price £10.00 (All rights reserved).

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. C.W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.).*
Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*
Secretary: Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*
Assistant Zoologist: Mr. A. PENROSE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**
Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 3, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**
Prof. E. BINDER *(Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, CH 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland)* (30 September 1972) **Mollusca**
Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**
Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**
Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**
Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**
Prof. H.E. WELCH *(Department of Zoology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3T 2N2 Canada)* (17 March 1976) **Nematoda**
Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**
Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(College Fellow in Life Sciences, School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(Councillor)* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**
Dr. Curtis W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (29 September 1976) *(President)* **Diptera**
Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia; E D P Methods**
Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**
Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN, *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**
Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Octocorallia; Systematics**
Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**
Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**
Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**
Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN, *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**
Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**
Mr. David HEPPELL *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**
Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**
Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**
Dr. SHUNICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3–23–1. Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**
Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Sir Peter E. Kent, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brink
Prof. J.H. Callomon, F.R.I.C.
Prof. C.B. Cox
Prof. D. Curry, F.G.S.
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. C.W. Sabrosky *(ex officio)*
Sir Eric Smith, F.R.S.
Dr. C.A. Wright *(Observer)*

B. The Officer of the Trust

Mr. R. V. Melville, M.Sc. *(Scientific Controller)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 40, part 1 (pp. 1–66) 29 March 1983

NOTICES

(a) *Date of commencement of voting.* In normal circumstances the Commission may start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications in the present part is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretariat of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretariat before the close of the six-month period.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a-b and 79b):

(1) *Pseudopontia* Plötz *v. Gonophlebia* Felder (Insecta, Lepidoptera): settlement of case. Z.N.(S.) 1688. C.F. Cowan.

(2) Request for a ruling to correct homonymy in names of the family-groups based on *Myrmecia* (Insecta) and *Myrmecium* (Arachnida). Z.N.(S.) 2223. J. Reiskind.

(3) On family group names based upon *Eurhin, Eurhinus* and *Eurhynchus* (Coleoptera). Z.N.(S.) 2269. E.C. Zimmerman; R.T. Thompson.

*(4) *Myzus festucae* Theobald, 1917 (Insecta, Aphidoidea): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2389. H.L.G. Stroyan.

(5) *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903 (Crustacea, Copepoda): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 1517. W. Vervoort & L.B. Holthuis.

(6) ANUROPODIDAE in Crustacea Isopoda and in Crustacea Tanaidacea: proposal to remove the homonymy. Z.N.(S.) 2429. M. Bacescu, J. Sieg & L.B. Holthuis.

(7) *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862 and *Callaphis* Walker, 1870 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Aphididae): proposals to remove the confusion. Z.N.(S.) 2153. F.W. Quednau.

(8) UROPLAT — as the stem of Family Group names in Amphibia and Insecta (Coleoptera): proposals to remove the Homonymy. Z.N.(S.) 2373. H.M. Smith, U.N. Lanham & A. Loveridge.

(9) *Oeciacus vicarius* Horváth, 1912 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Cimicidae): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2358. R.C. Froeschner, E.V. Coan & R.E. Ryckman.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since the publication of vol. 39(4) on 7 December 1982 (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b.):

(1) *Chelonia* Brongniart, 1800 (Reptilia, Chelonii): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2428. R. Bour & A. Dubois.

(2) ANUROPODIDAE in Isopoda and Tanaidacea (Crustacea): proposals to remove the homonymy. Z.N.(S.) 2429. A. Bacescu, J. Sieg & L.B. Holthuis.

(3) *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891 (Mammalia): proposed designation of a neotype under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2430. R.L. Cifelli & M.F. Soria.

(4) *Allygus* Fieber, 1871 (Insecta, Homoptera): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 2431. F. Ossdavilssu.

(5) *Glossodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831 (Gastropoda): proposed conservation and clarification. Z.N.(S.) 2432. W.B. Rudman.

(6) *Sphaeroma* Latreille, 1802 (Crustacea, Isopoda): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 2433. K. Harrison.

(7) *Semionotus* Agassiz, 1832 (Pisces): proposed designation of *Semionotus bergeri* as type species under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2434. A.R. McCune.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

NEW ARRANGEMENTS FOR PUBLISHING THE BULLETIN

As already announced in previous issues of the *Bulletin*, from 1 January 1983 the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, Farnham House, Farnham Royal, Slough, U.K. SL2, 3BN, have agreed to handle the printing and distribution of the *Bulletin*.

Some subscribers may have already received notices from the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux including a request for payment in advance for *volume 40* (1983). It is hoped that this change will cause no more than a temporary inconvenience. Unfortunately some invoices for *volume 39* (1982) were sent out late. This was because Mr E. Leonard, the Trust's Accountant and Publications Officer for many years, resigned for domestic and health reasons. This led inevitably to some dislocation. The arrival of late demands to pay for 1982 and early demands for 1983 is regretted but it is hoped subscribers will understand why this has happened.

This Trust is confident that CAB, a large organisation handling

many periodical publications and with extensive international connexions, will provide an improved service and ultimately increase the circulation with economies in operation not available to the Commission or the Trust.

FORMAT CHANGES IN THE BULLETIN

Readers will notice that following the changes referred to above, the *Bulletin* has a new cover design. Also the table of contents is transferred from an inside page to the back cover; this should help busy readers find items more speedily and is in line with the practice of many other scientific journals. The type face has been changed to 'Times' but in other respects format is unchanged.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

We acknowledge with grateful thanks the following donations towards the Trust's Appeal Fund received since the last list was published in volume 39 part 4, December 1982: The Lesley–David Trust (further donation), Dr and Mrs David Lewis (further donation), Dr F.J. Meggitt, The John Spedan Lewis Trust for the Advancement of the Natural Sciences, Dr K.M. Harris, Dr K.G.V. Smith, Lady M. Casson, Dr J.D. Holland, the National Science Museum of Japan, Lord Medway's Charitable Trust, Mr R. d'Erlanger and the BP Group of Companies. Covenanted donations have been received from Dr R.W. Crosskey, Dr J.D. George, Mrs J.M. Pope, Dr E.F. Owen and Elmrace Holdings. The gross value of the Appeal Fund now stands at over £28,000 (not counting expenditures).

It is encouraging to report increasing international interest in the Appeal. Apart from the donations already recorded from Australia, New Zealand and Japan, good progress is being made with the establishment of a charitable association in the U.S.A. and the possibilities of setting up a similar organisation in Canada. Three member countries of the European Science Foundation – Denmark, Ireland and Sweden – have expressed their willingness to contribute.

Meanwhile, the arrangements for the future publication and distribution of the *Bulletin* announced in September 1982 (*Bull.* vol. 39, pp. 154–155) are now in effect. While editorial policy and the supply of matter for publication will continue to be a responsibility of the Secretary to the Commission, all questions on distribution and sales should be addressed to the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, Farnham House, Farnham Royal, Slough SL2 3BN.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
March, 1983

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31st DECEMBER, 1981

1980				
		FIXED ASSETS		
		OFFICE EQUIPMENT at cost	800	
		Less: Accumulated Depreciation	538	
291				262
		CURRENT ASSETS		
4,178		Amounts due from Sales	8,910	
117		Income and other Taxes Recoverable	—	
22,106		Cash at Bank and in Hand (Note 1)	33,045	
	26,401			41,955
	26,692			42,217
		CURRENT LIABILITIES		
1,449		Sundry Creditors	1,701	
2,476		Subscriptions received in Advance	2,477	
—		Income and other Taxes Due	3	
—		Bank and Cash adjustment	2	
	3,925			4,183
	£22,767			£38,034
		ACCUMULATED FUNDS		
		REVENUE RESERVE		
7,825		Balance at 31st December, 1980		10,767
2,942		Surplus for 1981		13,267
	10,767			24,034
	12,000	Specific Provision (Note 2)		14,000
	£22,767			£38,034

NOTES: 1. The Stock of Publications has not been valued.
2. The provision made for printing of the 3rd Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, consists of £5,000 received as a specific donation, £7,000 allocated from the funds of the Trust and £2,000 received as an interest free loan.

P.E. Kent
D. Curry
Members of the Management Committee

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31st DECEMBER, 1981

	1980			
		SALE OF PUBLICATIONS		
	274	International Code		32
	9,858	Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature		13,180
	315	Opinions		2
	—	Official Lists		45
	10,447			13,259
	10,610	DONATIONS		12,137
	—	DEEDS OF COVENANT		19
	1,554	BANK DEPOSIT INTEREST		1,879
	22,611			27,294
		Less: ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES		
6,216		Salaries and N.I. Contributions	6,968	
2,319		Office Expenses	1,704	
100		Audit Fee	125	
8,635			8,797	
4,002		Printing and Distribution of Publications	5,201	
32		Depreciation of Office Equipment	29	
	12,669			14,027
	9,942			13,267
	7,000	*Less:* PROVISION (Note 2)		—
	£2,942	SURPLUS FOR THE YEAR carried to BALANCE SHEET		£13,267

REPORT OF THE AUDITORS

In our opinion the above Balance Sheet and annexed Income and Expenditure Account give a true and fair view of the state of the Company's affairs as at the 31st December, 1981 and of the operating Surplus for the year ended on that date and comply with the Companies Acts 1948 to 1981.

3, Great James Street,
Bedford Row,
London, WC1N 3DH.

24th December, 1982

MORLEY, GRAYRIGGE & CO.
Chartered Accountants

FINANCIAL REPORT FOR 1981

In 1981, sales of the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature brought in £13,180, an increase of £3,180 over 1980. This was not due to an increased number of subscribers but to an effort to collect payments more promptly. The balance sheet shows £8,910 owing from sales (£4,178 in 1980) but at the date of audit only £1,480 remained unpaid. The auditors confirm that there are few bad debts, only slow payers. Donations brought in £12,156 (£10,610 in 1980) which includes the final subvention of £5,000 from the Royal Society and $10,000 from IUBS. Salaries and other expenses were little changed at £8,798 (£8,635). Printing, distribution of publications and depreciation increased by 31% to £5,230 (£4,002 in 1980). The surplus for the year was £13,267 (£16,942 in 1980). These surpluses were essential if the Trust and the Commission were to survive through 1982 and 1983. In these years, our income will be £10,000 less than in 1980 and £5,000 less than in 1981 because subventions from the British Government via the Royal Society paid in 1978, 1979 and 1980 at £5,000 per annum and from IUBS in 1979, 1980, 1981 for a like amount will not be forthcoming.

The costs of salaries, national health insurance and office services were contained in 1981 only by economies. These included no scientific assistance for Mr Melville, Secretary of the Commission, dispensing with the services of an accountant/publications officer, withdrawing stock of Bulletins and Opinions from warehouse storage, and other steps. The surpluses will tide us over the difficult years 1982 and 1983 while new sources of funds are sought.

To secure the publication of the 3rd edition of the *Code of Zoological Nomenclature* when the script becomes available, a fund of £14,000 has been set aside made up as follows:–

Donations from the Curry Trust	£5.000
Provision from ITZN reserves in 1982	7,000
Repayable interest-free loan from the Chairman of the Trust	2,000
	£14,000

F.G.W. JONES
Managing Director and Secretary, International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

12 January, 1983

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

GENERAL MEETING, CARLETON UNIVERSITY, OTTAWA, CANADA, 23–27 AUGUST 1982

(N.B. These minutes follow the order of business set out in the Agenda, not that in which the items were dealt with. R.V.M.)

Present: C. W. Sabrosky (President) in the chair: Bayer, Bernardi, Corliss, Heppell, Holthuis, Kraus, Lehtinen, Ride, Welch and the Secretary.

1. Apologies for absence had been received from Brinck, Cogger, Hahn, Halvorsen, Mroczkowski and Nye.

2. The minutes of the previous general meeting (Helsinki, 1979) had been published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 203–208.

3. (At a preliminary meeting, Mr Heppell distributed his report on the Special Interest symposium on zoological nomenclature held at the ICSEB II Congress at Vancouver in 1980, see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 206–207); the Secretary outlined a report on the financial future of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on the agreement between the Trust and Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux for the publication of the *Bulletin*, and on progress with the appeal for financial support; and the President reported progress towards the organisation of a U.S. non-profit, tax-exempt body to solicit funds for the support of the work of the Commission. General procedures for later working sessions were outlined.

4. The Secretary presented the report on the last three years' work that he had prepared for IUBS.

5. The Commission considered candidates for nomination to the Section on Zoological Nomenclature for election to the Commission. Five vacancies arose from the expiry of the terms of service of Habe, Heppell, Nye, Tortonese and Willink (among them Habe and Nye did not wish to be considered) and a sixth by the resignation of Vokes. The Council had agreed that Heppell, Tortonese and Willink were eligible for re-nomination; 13 other nominations had been received. It was agreed not to nominate or renominate any candidate over the age of 60.

In the course of a lengthy discussion, the drawbacks of the procedure used at Helsinki were recognised. Under that procedure, each retiring member was paired against another candidate and the Commission's preference indicated (Bylaw 3c). On the present occasion it was found that the 16 candidates comprised eight entomologists and eight non-entomologists, and it was agreed to present three pairs of nominations from each set (with preferences indicated). At that point it was agreed to amend Bylaw 3c (see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, p. 177) by deleting the words 'in each case' in line 3, by replacing the word 'between' in line 4 by the words 'from the' and by deleting the last four

words 'for a given vacancy'. Later, however, it was agreed to revert to the former procedure. The following slate was accordingly drawn up for presentation to the Section on Zoological Nomenclature:

Name	*Country*	*Speciality*	*Name*	*Country*	*Speciality*
Cocks	U.K.	Brachiopoda	Nielsen	Denmark	Marine Biology
*Heppell	U.K.	Mollusca	Skarlato	U.S.S.R.	Mollusca
Savage	U.S.A.	Reptilia	Nelson	Canada	Ichthyology
Schuster	Austria	Limnology	Saether	Norway	Limnology
Ueno	Japan	Entomology	Odhiambo	Kenya	Entomology
*Willink	Argentina	Hymenoptera	Brothers	S. Africa	Hymenoptera

The candidates preferred by the Commission are given in the left-hand column: retiring Commissioners are indicated by an asterisk.

6. Under Bylaw 16, Bayer and Lehtinen were appointed to join the Council to nominate two candidates for President. It was agreed that the election of the President should be completed by 1 July 1983.

7. The Secretary reported the agreement between the Trust and the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux. Under this agreement the Bureaux would be the publishers and distributors of the *Bulletin* and would be responsible for the associated administrative work. They would retain the subscription income and would pay £10,000 a year to the Trust. This agreement would run for two years and would be re-negotiable annually thereafter.

Dr David Hawksworth, Secretary to the Bureaux, was invited to outline the structure and activities of the CAB to show how the publication of the *Bulletin* would fit in to these. He showed how the publishing facilities of CAB would benefit the Commission. Arrangements for supplying authors' reprints would continue as before.

In reply to a question from Dr Ride, Dr Hawksworth said that the CAB was equipped for computerised typesetting of the *Bulletin*. Dr Ride asked whether a two-tiered price structure for subscriptions to the *Bulletin* could be considered and some discussion followed.

Dr Hawksworth asked if editorial policy would allow reviews and articles of general interest to be included so as to increase the appeal (and hence the saleability) of the *Bulletin*. The Secretary explained that priority must be given to applications to the Commission, at least until the backlog of cases had been materially reduced. The effect of the introduction of general articles in *Taxon* on the publication of nomenclatural matter was cited by the President as a cautionary example.

8. The report of a working party on a proposal to re-draft Article 3a of the Constitution, determining the term of service of Commissioners and already published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 38, pp. 163–165, was then discussed. This had been examined by Dr Ride, who proposed transferring most of this matter to the Bylaws. This reduced the amendment to the Constitution to a short clause replacing the existing provision by one providing for the division of members into classes

according to the dates of their election or most recent re-election. The report was adopted by eight votes to one.

9. Various matters affecting the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature were discussed at length in the intervals of other business. They are dealt with in an appendix to these minutes.

10. Format and content of the *Bulletin*. See item 7.

11. Any other business.

(a) Dr Ride put a motion designed to ensure the continuing functioning of the Commission in the new framework of IUBS that followed the adoption of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Review. This envisaged the Commission becoming an interdisciplinary commission within the Union, reporting directly to the General Assembly; the removal of the Section on Nomenclature from the structure of IUBS; and the assumption by the Commission of responsibility for ensuring that the functions of the Section in (i) electing members to the Commission, (ii) amending the Code and (iii) amending the Constitution, would be carried out and reported to the General Assembly. This motion was adopted with some modifications of the text. (The consequential steps required of the General Assembly were duly embodied in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Admissions and Structures to the final plenary session of the Assembly.)

(b) Dr Ride proposed a Declaration to clarify the status of suppressed and rejected works. This would show that no name or nomenclatural act could be accepted from a work rejected because of not conforming to the provisions of the Code, or suppressed by the Commission, but that information in such works could be used for the purposes of Articles 12 and 13. Mr Heppell asked what was the status of type-designations for taxa described in rejected works. Dr Ride thought that even if general questions were covered by a Declaration, certain cases might need to be dealt with by Directions. He asked Mr Heppell to prepare a paper showing whether the problem could be solved by amending the Code.

(c) The President wished to see the majority of cases of misidentified type species dealt with by some automatic procedure. The Secretary pointed out that most cases of this kind involved violation of Articles 67b(ii) and 69a(i), and that such action ought to be controlled by the plenary powers.

(d) Mr Heppell questioned the way in which abstentions in voting were counted. The Secretary explained that an abstention merely reduced the total of votes validly cast and hence the number of votes needed to obtain a two-thirds majority. However, although an abstention could not be counted as a vote, it would not be reckoned against the abstainer's voting record so long as the voting paper was returned. Mr Heppell still considered that the procedure should be clarified.

(e) Dr Lehtinen launched a general discussion on the role of nomenclature in zoology today. Young zoologists were better educated

and had access to higher technology (including computers) than previous generations. They were impatient with the numerous doubtful taxa described in the early European literature and thus were unwilling to embark on much-needed revisions. They found the Code too complex and subject to too frequent changes; it was too conservative in its concepts — modern zoology recognises five kingdoms, not two. Action by the Commission was too slow and there was a need for specialist committees in certain groups. A strong Commission that could react quickly to the needs of young taxonomists was needed.

Dr Corliss agreed, and pointed out that among the five kingdoms of animals, plants, fungi, protists and 'Monera', the protist kingdom alone now contained 36 phyla. He outlined three alternative long-term objectives: a single Code for all living things; or separate codes for each kingdom; or modifications of existing codes to deal with problem groups such as the dinoflagellates.

(f) Mr Heppell asked why the substantive proposal for the treatment of *-i* and *-ii* terminations of specific names as permissible alternatives had never been put to a separate vote. He would not accept the decisive rejection of the proposal by the Commission at its Stensoffa meeting in 1979 and insisted that the matter must be voted on. It was eventually agreed to incorporate a separate vote on this in the voting paper on the Code. However, even if the original proposal was adopted, it could not be incorporated in the third edition of the Code without imposing an intolerable delay.

(g) Dr Ride briefly presented two reports that he had prepared for the General Assembly on two resolutions adopted by IUBS at Helsinki. One concerned the differences between the zoological and botanical approaches to nomenclature and the consequences for administration and finance. The other concerned the nomenclature of taxa considered by some to be animals and by others to be plants.

APPENDIX

Agenda Item 9. Matters concerning the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature

(a) *Publication.* Discussion of this topic centred mainly on the status of works produced by xerography, with particular reference to theses. Dr Ride stressed the importance of evidence of intent to publish and cited the requirement of the Botanical Code for a Latin diagnosis in that connection. After prolonged discussion, Dr Welch indicated several points on which a measure of agreement had been reached:

(1) the importance of liaison with the authorities in botanical nomenclature with a view to developing a common approach to this problem;

(2) the difficulty of determining the status of theses produced on

demand by electrostatic photocopying methods from single copies of typescript;

(3) the fact that economic and technological pressures are making resort to xerography increasingly common;

(4) the difficulty of determining the date of publication of such products except, in some cases, indirectly from published catalogues of titles or abstracts;

(5) the variation in editorial policy of standard journals in accepting or refusing re-publication of matter from theses already issued by xerography, and the need for higher standards of refereeing and editing;

(6) the need for some demonstration of intent to publish in works produced by other than conventional methods of printing.

The President then called for an expression of the opinion of the meeting on four questions:

(a) should works containing a disclaimer of intent to publish be considered not published?
(5 affirmative, 3 negative);

(b) should works produced by unconventional means be required to include evidence of intent to publish?
(3 affirmative, 5 negative);

(c) (i) should works containing a disclaimer of intent to publish be considered not published even if Article 8 was satisfied; (ii) should works produced by unconventional methods be required to include evidence of intent to publish in addition to satisfying Article 8; (iii) in the absence of either a disclaimer or evidence of intent to publish, should the provisions of the Code be applied?
(8 affirmative, 0 negative);

(d) should xerography be accepted retroactively as an acceptable method of publication?
(5 affirmative, 3 negative).

It was generally accepted that xerography could not be excluded on pragmatic grounds and that, whatever was decided about theses, the status of reputable periodicals produced by xerography should be protected. The President suggested that the subject should be discussed in the Section on Zoological Nomenclature, and then considered again by the Commission.

Consideration was accordingly resumed after the Commission had heard the strongly expressed views of the Section on Nomenclature (see pp. 13–14). The President asked for an expression of views on the date on which any regulations concerning unconventional methods of publication should come into effect. Dr Ride said that the Commission as a whole should be asked whether it was their wish that the decision at Helsinki to remove the 'ink on paper' requirement for publication had

been intended to be retroactive or not. Those members present expressed a preference for a fixed date in the future. They thought that zoologists should be given plenty of notice of any new regulations, which should come into force on 1 January 1986.

(b) *Status of names on Official Lists.* Mr Heppell presented the report of a working group established at Helsinki on this point. He wished to know whether such names had (i) enhanced status over other available names, or (ii) enhanced status only if placed on the Lists as 'validated names', or (iii) no enhanced status. If the last was true, the Lists would be a single register of names considered by the Commission.

Dr Kraus thought that zoologists expected the Lists to contain correct names that must be used, and that only exceptionally should such names be reconsidered. Otherwise the credibility of the Commission would be undermined. In the President's opinion, names on the Lists were not sacred but could always be re-examined.

Mr Heppell drew attention to a conflict between Articles 78f and 84 arising out of the fact that the Paris (1948) and Copenhagen (1953) decisions giving absolute protection to all names on the Lists had not been incorporated into the 1961 Code. Such names were described as 'validated' in the Introduction to the first published instalment of the Lists. Moreover, the Secretariat had continued to use the term 'validated' for names placed on the Lists up to 1974. Had the term the same force in that period as it had had prior to 1961? It seemed to him that the status of names on the Lists was not uniform but varied according to the date when they were placed there.

The Secretary thought that it was of the utmost importance that the status of names in the Lists should be uniform, and that all necessary steps should be taken to ensure this. He moved that the report be referred back to the working group with instructions to reach conclusions and make recommendations. This was accepted.

(c) *Paranomenclature.* Dr Welch presented his report on names for collective groups and summarised the history of their use in helminthology. He pointed out that while taxonomists can readily procure adult worms for identification, ecologists and other field workers are often forced to work with immature stages. Thus, even though many species first described in collective groups have been allocated to adult genera, many have still not been allocated. The Commission concluded that the provisions dealing with collective groups should be retained in the Code.

(d) *The term 'onomatophore'.* The Secretary presented the case for using this term in the Code for name-bearing types at all levels. The Commission decided not to do so.

(e) *Types and nominal taxa.* (f) *Problems of family-group names.* Lack of time prevented constructive discussion of these items.

(g) *Proposed changes to third edition of Code.* (i) A proposal to introduce provisions to cover unintended original spellings (see *Bull.*

zool. Nom. vol. 35, p. 242) was rejected. (ii) A proposal to delete Article 51d, d(i) from the Code was rejected. The presence of parentheses around the name of an author of a specific name in a changed continuation was felt not only to be useful as an indication of the history of the name, but also to be important in situations of secondary homonymy.

Unconfirmed minutes of the meeting of the Section on Nomenclature of the Division of Zoology of IUBS, Museum of Natural Sciences, Ottawa, Canada, on 26 August 1982

1. Dr Sabrosky, Chairman of the Section, took the chair. Eleven members of the Commission and more than 30 zoologists from the Ottawa region were present.

2. The Commission presented its slate of nominees for election as follows:

Cocks	Nielsen
*Heppell	Skarlato
Savage	Nelson
Schuster	Saether
Ueno	Odhiambo
*Willink	Brothers

The candidates in the left-hand column were preferred by the Commission (retiring Commissioners are marked by an asterisk). The Secretary explained the constraints under which the Commission had to work in preparing its nominations. The Section duly elected the candidates preferred by the Commission.

3. Dr Ride presented a motion, already adopted by the Commission, designed to ensure the continued functioning of the Commission within the new framework of IUBS resulting from the adoption of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Review. He proposed, and Dr Bayer seconded, that this motion be adopted by the Section. The motion was approved.

4. Dr Ride briefly presented his reports to the General Assembly on (a) differences in approach between the botanical and the zoological systems of nomenclatural regulation, and (b) on the nomenclature of organisms considered by some to be animals and by others to be plants.

5. There being no other formal business, the Section discussed problems of publication, at the request of the Ottawa zoologists. In a lively and instructive discussion the following points were made:

(a) many theses deposited with publishers who produce photocopies on demand have never seen the light of day by that means. To accept them now would cause chaos, especially if backdated;

(b) publication of theses by xerography by such firms takes no account of the criteria of the Code;
(c) the quality of the scientific work is not taken into account in publishing theses by those methods;
(d) most North American zoologists do not accept such products as publications;
(e) the point that backdated acceptance of such works would cause chaos was reiterated;
(f) on the other hand, many thought that quality of scientific work was more important than the technique of production and wished to see more stringent controls on this type of publication;
(g) the question was asked whether a statement of the author's intent to publish or to proclaim publication was of crucial importance;
(h) it was reported that the botanists see two issues here: the technique of mechanical production and the question of 'effectiveness' of publication (i.e., are numerous identical copies simultaneously available?).

The meeting was asked to vote on the following questions:

		Affirmative Votes
1.	Should theses published by xerography never be accepted as publications?	20
2.	Should such productions be accepted from some future date?	11
3.	Should the acceptance of such productions be backdated?	0

The meeting then closed. It was followed by a reception given by Dr Gruchy, Acting Director of the Museum of Natural Sciences, during which informal discussions continued.

ANOLIS DAUDIN, 1802 (REPTILIA): REQUEST FOR THE DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 1603

[Note by the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. This was the subject of an application by H. M. Smith (then of *Department of Zoology and Museum of Natural History, University of Illinois, U.S.A.*) and E. E. Williams & J. D. Lazell (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, U.S.A.*) published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 20, pp. 438–439, 1963. Only one comment was received. Members were invited to vote on Voting Paper (65)34 under the Three-Month Rule for or against the proposals set out in that application. At the close of the voting period on 3 January 1966, 20 Commissioners had voted for it, and one, Dr C. W. Sabrosky, against it. In his comments Dr Sabrosky cited several errors and oddities in the application and he urged that it should be redrafted and resubmitted. The matter was therefore re-opened and a number of comments were received. We now publish (1) the comments by Dr Sabrosky on the original application, and (2) a counter proposal to the original application by Dr A. F. Stimson and Dr G. Underwood. R.V.M.]

(1) COMMENT ON THE TYPE SPECIES OF *ANOLIS* DAUDIN, 1802

by Dr C. W. Sabrosky (*Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*)

The application dealing with this case contains so many errors and peculiar situations that I believe it should be resubmitted to the Commission with the following comments:

The oddity of a hyphenated type citation by able nomenclaturist Stejneger caused me to examine the original literature, and the following errors came to light:

Paragraph 2, lines 9–10: *Lacerta bullaris* rests on Catesby's plate 66 (and accompanying brief description), not on plate 55, which is the corn snake [the error is in quoting Brown, 1908, who had the plate number correct].

Paragraph 3, line 3: The 'devious notation' 'type: *bullaris–carolinensis*' is a prejudicial expression that is not borne out in the Stejneger and Barbour Check Lists. It actually appears in all editions as "TYPE: *bullaris* = carolinensis." Significantly they used the sign of equality, not a hyphen, and italicised the first name (*bullaris*), but not the second. Examination of their format shows that the non-italicised name was that adopted as valid, and the italicised name was a synonym. Obviously, since *bullaris* is a much older name than *carolinensis*, Stejneger and Barbour could only have meant *bullaris* of Daudin, at least in part. Incidentally, from pencilled notes by Stejneger in the Smithsonian Institution's copy of Boulenger's catalogue of lizards (1885, p. 43), it is obvious that they were following Boulenger in interpreting *bullaris* of Daudin as partly *caroli-*

nensis and partly *chlorocyanus.*

Paragraph 6: It is hard to say that *bullaris* Linnaeus is a 'forgotten' name when it was used repeatedly in the type citations, even though as *bullaris* sensu Daudin.

Paragraph 2: The 1961 Code does not state in so many words that the first selection takes precedence over any other, but it does state the following very clearly in Article 61, lines 8–10: 'The type of any taxon, once fixed in conformity with the provisions of the Code, is not subject to change except by exercise of the plenary powers. . . .' If Stejneger (1904) did fix the type of *Anolis,* then it was not subject to change by Brown (1908).

Discussion

Regardless of errors, and of the citations, devious or otherwise, in the Stejneger and Barbour Check Lists, the base rests ultimately on Daudin, 1802, the original publication of *Anolis,* and Stejneger, 1904.

Daudin presumed to recognise *bullaris* Linnaeus, but his conception was a broad one and included both forms figured by Catesby, no. 66 for *bullaris* Linnaeus and no. 65 for what was later (Voigt, 1832) named *carolinensis.* Stejneger's designation of *bullaris* in 1904 picked an originally included species, and fixed the type as *bullaris* Linnaeus.

Daudin's *bullaris* was not a misidentification but a mixture of true *bullaris* and other forms now known to be distinct species. It cannot then be interpreted as a misidentified type species situation, and the Stejneger and Barbour Check Lists were wrong in so doing. The Smith and Taylor Check List of Mexican lizards (1950) not only continued this error but in addition cited the type as *Anolis bullaris* Daudin (correctly *bullaris* Linnaeus sensu Daudin).

Obviously, the identity of *bullaris* Linnaeus is a critical facet of the problem. I examined Catesby's figure 66, together with Dr James A. Peters, herpetologist at the U.S. National Museum, and it is clearly a specimen of *Anolis.* Even if it could not be recognised to species, it might remain as the type species of the genus, without difficulty; this has been done in other genera! But it is possible to recognise the species with present detailed knowledge of the fauna, even if it were not possible in past times. Underwood & Williams (1959, *Bull. Inst. Jamaica*, Sci. Ser. 9, 48 pp.) have an excellent review of 'The anoline lizards of Jamaica'. Catesby's good coloured figure and description of 'Lacerta viridis jamaicensis' as a common green Jamaican lizard with reddish throat fan is identifiable as more than 'an act of faith'. Incidentally, I found to my astonishment that there was no mention in this bulletin of *bullaris* Linnaeus, which was originally described from Jamaica; indeed the authors state that the first Jamaican anoline lizard to be described was *Xiphocerus valencienni* by Duméril & Bibron in 1837!

I understand also that there is a possibility that the genus *Anolis* may be divided, on zoological grounds. Current revisers of the genus should certainly be consulted, lest a type fixation at this point fix the name *Anolis* on the smallest or least important section of the genus.

At present, I am unconvinced by the arguments, and believe that the rules could be applied strictly to the present case.

(2) COMMENTS ON THE TYPE SPECIES OF *ANOLIS* DAUDIN, 1802. Z.N.(S.) 1603

By Andrew F. Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD*) and Garth L. Underwood (*Department of Biological Sciences, City of London Polytechnic, 117 Houndsditch, London, EC3*)
(see vol. 20, pp. 438–439)

The type species of *Anolis* Daudin, 1802, p. 50, is *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 208 by subsequent designation of Stejneger, 1904, p. 625.

Smith, Williams & Lazell, 1963, petitioned the Commission to set aside Stejneger's designation and to designate *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt, 1832, p. 71 the type species of *Anolis*. These authors' main reasons for wishing to reject *bullaris* as the type species were (a) that the name was a *nomen oblitum* and (b) that it was of uncertain identity.

We feel that both reasons are arguable. It is true that *bullaris* was a *nomen oblitum* in the sense of the 1961 Code inasmuch as it had been unused as a senior synonym for more than 50 years. That the name was unused as a senior synonym was simply because some authors considered it unidentifiable while others, quite erroneously, considered it a junior synonym of *Anolis carolinensis*. The name was certainly not 'forgotten' in any real sense. Indeed, its enigmatic nature has been the subject of some discussion (Brown, 1908, p. 116; Stuart, 1963, p. 59).

Lacerta bullaris Linnaeus was based on *Lacertus viridis jamaicensis* Catesby (1743, plate 66). In an attempt to throw some light on its identity we examined this plate. The figure of a green lizard spreading a large orange throat fan is clearly a male anole. There are three such anoles in Jamaica: *Anolis garmani* Stejneger, 1899, p. 601; *A. grahami grahami* Gray, 1845, p. 274; and *A. grahami aquarum* Underwood & Williams, 1959, p. 28.

The text in English and in French accompanying Catesby's plate gives further information. *Lacertus viridis jamaicensis* was a 'shining grass green colour' ('vert vif' in French), 'usually six inches long' and 'common in Jamaica frequenting hedges and trees but are not seen in houses'.

'Vert vif' fits *A. garmani* and *A. grahami aquarum* better than *A. grahami grahami*. Over most of the island the latter has a bluish green head with more yellowish green on the back and sides; in some parts of the island there is mottling, especially on the head. The base of the tail is, in most of the island, purple (this is the basis of Gosse's *iodurus*), more distally the tail is dark. *A. grahami aquarum* normally has blue on the base of the tail. Catesby's figure shows uniform green coloration. The orange throat fan shown by Catesby could belong to any of the three forms.

'Usually six inches long' is rather obscure since we do not know how Catesby estimated his lengths. If he intended to indicate snout-vent length then six inches is too long for all three forms. If he intended total length then six inches is too short for all three forms. However, we do have a clue. The text to Catesby's plate 65 describes *Lacertus viridis carolinensis* (= *Anolis carolinensis*) as being five inches long (it actually has a total length of about six inches). Assuming Catesby's estimates were consistent, *Lacertus viridis jamaicensis* would have been about 20% longer than *Anolis carolinensis*. This would fit *Anolis grahami grahami* and *A. grahami aquarum* but not a full grown adult male of the larger *A. garmani* whose total length is about ten inches.

'Not seen in houses' is characteristic of *Anolis garmani*. *A. grahami gra-*

hami is commonly found in houses. We are not familiar with the habits of *A. grahami aquarum* but guess they would be similar to those of *A. grahami grahami.*

Thus it would seem that no one species fits all the facts as given by Catesby.

Anolis grahami aquarum is restricted to the east end of the island, an area sparsely populated even today. We think it unlikely that Catesby would have stayed there in the early part of the eighteenth century.

Of the other two forms we feel that *A. garmani* better fits the facts. It is bright green and does not enter houses, whereas *A. grahami grahami* is not bright green and commonly enters houses. Only the estimated length suggests *A. grahami grahami* and this could easily be the result of Catesby's inconsistency in assessing the lengths of two lizards seen at different times and in different places.

We therefore consider *Anolis garmani* Stejneger, 1899, a junior synonym of *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus, 1758. The name *garmani* has appeared in the primary zoological literature only about twenty times since it was first published and we do not believe that its replacement would cause much confusion.

Etheridge, 1967, p. 717, split the genus *Anoiis* into two groups on the basis of the structure of their caudal vertebrae. He made no formal taxonomic division, referring to the two groups simply as alpha anoles and beta anoles. *Anolis carolinensis* is an alpha anole, does not occur in Jamaica and was not one of the species originally included in the genus *Anolis* Daudin, 1802. We do not therefore consider it an appropriate choice for fixation of the type species. It so happens that *Anolis bullaris*, (i.e. *A. garmani* Auct.) *A. grahami* and indeed all Jamaican anoles are beta anoles. It therefore seems logical that the type species should be a beta anole. Leaving *Lacerta bullaris* as the type species would achieve this.

We therefore request the Commission:

(1) to place the generic name *Anolis* Daudin, 1802, (gender: masculine), type species by subsequent designation by Stejneger, 1904, *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus, 1758, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(2) to place the specific name *bullaris* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Lacerta bullaris* (specific name of type species of *Anolis* Daudin, 1802) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BROWN, A. E., 1908. Generic types of nearctic Reptilia and Amphibia. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia* vol. 60, pp. 112–127.

CATESBY, M., 1743. *The natural history of Carolina, Florida and the Bahama Islands:* ... vol. 2, 100 plates + Appendix, 20 plates.

DAUDIN, F. M., 1802. *Histoire naturelle, générale et particulière des reptiles* Paris. vol. 4. 397 pp.

ETHERIDGE, R., 1967. Lizard caudal vertebrae. *Copeia* 1967, pp. 699–721.

GRAY, J. E., 1845. *Catalogue of the specimens of lizards in the collection of the British Museum.* London. xxviii + 289 pp.

LINNAEUS, C., 1758. *Systema naturae.* 10th edition. Stockholm. vol. 1. 823 pp.

SMITH, H. M., WILLIAMS, E. E. & LAZELL, J. D., 1963. *Anolis* Daudin, 1803, (Reptilia, Lacertilia): Request for the designation of a type species under the plenary powers. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 20, pp. 438–439.

STEJNEGER, L., 1899. A new name for the great crested *Anolis* of Jamaica. *Am. Nat.* vol. 33, pp. 601–602.

—— 1904. The herpetology of Porto Rico. *Rep. U.S. natn. Mus.* vol. 129, pp. 549–724.

STUART, L. C., 1963. A checklist of the herpetofauna of Guatemala. *Misc. Publs. Mus. Zool. Univ. Mich.* vol. 122, pp. 1–150.

UNDERWOOD, G. L. & WILLIAMS, E. E., 1959. The anoline lizards of Jamaica. *Bull. Inst. Jamaica Sci. Ser.* vol. 9, pp. 1–48.

VOIGT, F. S., 1832. *in* CUVIER, G. L. C. F. D. *Das Thierreich* .... vol. 2, XVI+539 pp.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *ATTUS OTIOSUS* HENTZ, 1846 (ARANEAE, SALTICIDAE). Z.N.(S.) 2355

By Bruce Cutler
(*1747 Eustis Street, St Paul, Minnesota 55113, U.S.A.*)
(see vol. 39, pp. 64–66)

I wish to support Dr G. B. Edwards in his proposal that the name *Attus otiosus* Hentz, 1846 be conserved. By overwhelming usage this name should be retained over *Attus pulcher*. Dr Edwards is the leading authority on the genus *Phidippus*, and his research for the past few years has concentrated on this genus, particularly on the taxonomy. Although it is not technically a reason for suppressing the name *Attus pulcher* Walckenaer, 1837, the possibility exists for confusion with the legitimate name *Phidippus pulcherrimus* Keyserling, 1884. While *P. pulcherrimus* is a very different species in the same genus as the nomina in question, it does occur in the same geographic area.

GORGONIA FLABELLIFORMIS EICHWALD, 1840 (GRAPTOLITHINA): COMMENTS ON THE APPLICATION FOR A NEOTYPE DESIGNATION BY USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)1776

[*Introductory note by the Secretary.* In 1967, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 24, pp. 49–52, the late Professor O. M. B. Bulman applied for the use of the plenary powers to set aside the original material of the nominal species *Gorgonia flabelliformis* Eichwald, 1840, so that a neotype could be designated in such a way as to maintain stability of both zoological and stratigraphical nomenclature. Bulman sought, in effect, to set aside a lectotype designation for the species made by Obut, 1953, *Trudy Vnigri* vol. 78, pp. 26–57. He was supported by Dr F. F. Osborne (*Laval University, Quebec*), Sir James Stubblefield, FRS (*35 Kent Avenue, Ealing, London W.13*), Dr H. W. Ball (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) and Professor G. Henningsmoen (*Paleontologisk Museum, Oslo, Norway*). He was opposed by Professor A. M. Obut (*Institute of Geology and*

Geophysics, Novosibirsk, USSR) whose comment was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31, p. 104, p. 74. Professor Bulman unfortunately died before he had a chance to reply to Dr Obut and the case lapsed at that point. It is now possible to publish two further comments on it. R.V.M.]

(1) by Ph. Legrand (*Compagnie Française des Pétroles, Laboratoires Exploitation groupe TOTAL, 218–228 Avenue du Haut Leveque, 33605 Pessac Cedex, France.*)

L'espèce–type du genre *Dictyonema* Hall, 1851 est *Gorgonia retiformis* Hall, 1843. Elle a été désignée par S.A. Miller en 1889. Ce choix est absolument catastrophique ainsi que le soulignait déja R. Ruedemann, 1947, *Mem. geol. Soc. America* No. 19, p. 186. En effet cette espèce est rare et bon nombre de détails morphologiques sont inconnus: ainsi, on ne sait rien sur les premiers stades de croissance (présence d'une nema, taille de la sicula, nombre de branches primaires), ni sur la structure des stipes (nombre d'autothèques et caractères éventuels de leur ouverture, présence, taille et forme des bithèques). La définition actuelle du genre (Bulman, 1955 et 1970, *in Treatise of Invertebrate Paleontology*, ed. R. C. Moore, Part V, 1ère et 2e éditions) repose en fait beaucoup plus sur des observations faites à partir d'autres espèces et en particulier de *Dictyonema flabelliforme* sensu lato, que sur l'espèce–type. Aussi, toute tentative de subdivision du genre est théoriquement impossible faute de pouvoir préciser les différences ('diagnose' au sens étymologique du mot) par rapport à une référence qui n'existe pas.

2. Pour ce qui est du groupe de *Dictyonema flabelliforme* lui-même, une discussion s'est élevée au sujet du taxon qu'il convenait de considérer comme *Dictyonema flabelliforme* au sens strict.

(a) Eichwald, 1840, créait l'espèce *Gorgonia flabelliformis* à partir de spécimens d'Esthonie et plus précisément de Baltischport (=Paldiski), Odinsholm (=Osmusaar) et Zarskoje. La première figuration ne date que de 1842 ainsi d'ailleurs que la première description convenable, l'origine des échantillons étant seulement indiquée comme Esthland et Ostgothland. En 1861, l'appartenance au genre *Dictyonema* Hall, 1851 fut montrée par F. Schmidt. Peu après, Kjerulf, 1865, crèait deux espèces, *Dictyonema graptolithinum* et *D. norvegicum*. A partir de Brøgger, 1882, il fut considéré que *Dictyonema graptolithinum* était synonyme de *D. flabelliforme* forma typica et que *D. norvegicum* constituait une espèce ou une sous-espèce séparée. Pendant plus de 70 ans c'est sur cette base que se développa l'étude du groupe dont peu à peu des représentants furent retrouvés dans le monde entier.

(b) En 1953, Obut signalait que les spécimens originaux d'Eichwald avaient été retrouvés à l'Institut d'Histoire Géologique de Leningrad. Ces spécimens étaient accompagnés d'étiquettes de le main d'Eichwald: la localité d'origine était indiquée comme Reval (=Tallinn). Leur examen faisait apparaitre que la forme originelle de *Dictyonema flabelliforme* était celle appelée *Dictyonema flabelliforme norvegicum* ou *Dictyonema norvegicum* qui n'était donc qu'un synonyme alors que par contre *Dictyonema graptolithinum* constituait un taxon différent de rang spécifique ou subspécifique

correspondant à ce que l'usage avait conduit à appeler *Dictyonema flabelliforme* au sens strict, ou *D. flabelliforme flabelliforme*. Obut désignait un lectotype (spécimen 1/28 a2) parmi les spécimens retrouvés.

En fait, la certitude que ce soient bien les spécimens originaux d'Eichwald n'est pas absolue. Les localités ne correspondent pas, mais la ressemblance des figurations et des spécimens est troublante. En tout état de cause, cela ne change pas le fond du problème: on est conduit à inverser l'utilisation des noms par rapport aux objets auxquels ils se rapportent comme le montre le tableau ci–joint (Tableau 1).

(c) Cette inversion, après une si longue période d'usage, n'est pas sans soulever de nombreux problèmes:

— Le regroupement des différents taxons en tant que sous–espèces apparaît plus difficile en prenant comme espèce centrale *Dictyonema flabelliforme* au sens d'Eichwald et d'Obut qu'au sens de Brøgger et de Bulman, dont les spécimens constituent bien plus une forme moyenne;

— pour Obut, ce problème ne se pose pas, chaque taxon devant être considéré comme une espèce séparée, ce qui est peut-être exact dans certains cas, mais aurait besoin d'être démontré;

— en suivant cette voie, on arrive à de curieuses situations: ainsi *D. flabelliforme norvegicum* Kjerulf n'ayant pu être trouvé de façon certaine dans les Iles Britanniques (seule une forme *D. flabelliforme* cf. *norvegicum* est citée par Bulman, 1927), on est conduit à dire que *D. flabelliforme* n'existe pas dans les Iles Britanniques alors que c'est là que le groupe a fait l'objet du plus grand nombre d'études!

— Il est bien évident que pour les non spécialistes, et en particulier pour les stratigraphes, ce changement entraine une grande confusion. L'esotérisme de la paléontologie qui lui fait déjà tant de mal atteint ici son point extrême.

C'est pourquoi Bulman (1967) a demandé une suspension des règles du Code et a proposé de désigner un néotype provenant de la région de Pakerort, au nord de Paldiski en Esthonie, qui correspond à la définition admise couramment jusqu'en 1953 pour *D. flabelliforme flabelliforme*, tandis qu'un lectotype de *D. norvegicum* Kjerulf serait désigné sur un matériel de la région de Toyen près d'Oslo.

3. Pour la forme type du groupe de *D. flabelliforme* il faut de toute évidence éviter de prendre une sous-espèce dont les principaux caractères ne seraient pas connus. De ce point de vue, la sous-espèce retenue par Bulman présente de bien plus sérieuses garanties que si l'on revenait à *D. flabelliforme norvegicum* comme espèce type de ce groupe. Dans l'état actuel des choses, nous ne connaissons pas pour le matériel dans la localité–type ni la forme du rhabdosome, ni la présence, et a fortiori la taille des bithèques, nous ne possédons aucune indication sur le développement (sicula, nombre de branches primaires), et la position de cette sous–espèce dans une coupe stratigraphique régulièrement levée fait également défaut.

4. Si l'on admet la position d'Obut en application de la loi d'antériorité

TABLEAU I

Eichwald, 1842	Kjerulf, 1865	Brøgger, 1882 et autres travaux	Bulman, 1925–1967	Obut, 1953
G. flabelliformis	*D. graptolithinum* *D. norvegicum*	*D. flabelliformis* forma *typica*	*D. flabelliforme flabelliforme* *D. flabelliforme norvegicum*	*D. graptolithinum* *D. flabelliforme*

et si l'on fait abstraction de la confusion que ce choix risque d'entrainer, il reste:

— qu'il faudrait avoir le plus de détails possibles sur la morphologie, la structure de ce taxon qui deviendrait le taxon central du groupe;
— qu'il faudrait connaitre sa position stratigraphique précise.

C'est ce que j'avais déjà suggéré dans mon papier pour le groupe de travail sur la limite Cambrien-Ordovicien.

5. La première source de matériel qui pourrait être utilisée serait les coupes types ou les carottes de forages d'Esthonie où ce taxon a été cité à plusieurs reprises (Kaljo, D. & Kivimagi, E., 1970). Cependant, il semble:

— qu'il n'y a pas de vraies coupes types mais des terrains affleurant en falaise et que l'on récolte les fossiles à partir de blocs éboulés; de toute façon le matériel doit être assez altéré;
— qu'il n'est pas possible d'avoir accès aux carottes des forages faits dans un but de prospection minière.

6. La deuxième source de matériel pourrait être les carottes de forages en Pologne (Szymansky, B., 1966, 1973), dont j'ai pu examiner les spécimens en 1977 à Varsovie, mais ce matériel n'existe qu'en petite quantité.

7. L'absence de progrès depuis de nombreuses années, dans la connaissance de ce taxon, constitue à mon avis une raison scientifique sérieuse pour se demander si la loi d'antériorité doit bien jouer en l'occurrence.

REFERENCES

KALJO, D. & KIVIMAGI, E. 1970. On the distribution of graptolites in the *Dictyonema* shale of Estonia and on the uncontemporaneity of its different facies. *Eesti NSV Tead. Akad. Toim.* (Khim. geol. Ser.), vol. 19, pp. 334–341

SZYMANSKI, B. 1966. Lupki dictyonemawe warstw Kryzankischw rejonic Bialowiezy. *Kwartalnik geologiczny*, vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 44–62, tab., pls 1–6

——— 1973. Osadry tremadoku i arenigu na obsanze Bialowiezy. *Prace Inst. Geol.* vol. 69, 92 pp., 19 pls.

(2) By David Skevington (*Britoil plc., 150 St. Vincent Street, Glasgow G2 5LJ*).

A lectotype for *D. flabelliforme* (Eichwald) has been selected by Obut, 1953, and the specimen is presently housed in Leningrad. However, it has not been established beyond reasonable doubt that this specimen was one of Eichwald's original (1840) syntypes of *flabelliforme* and for this reason the validity of the lectotype is questionable.

2. If, however, Obut's lectotype is validly established and given formal recognition, then:

(i) *D. flabelliforme flabelliforme* auctorum becomes a senior synonym of *D. flabelliforme norvegicum*; the former name denotes the only subspecies (to date) of *D. flabelliforme* and the latter name disappears from the literature. All other subspecies hitherto referred to *D. flabelliforme* by Bulman and others (*anglicum, bryograptoides, desmograptoides,* etc.) must henceforth be included in *D. graptolithinum.* Effectively, therefore, an unnatural classification

will result, since *flabelliforme flabelliforme* (hitherto *flabelliforme norvegicum*) will be 'siphoned off' at the species level from subspecies (*graptolithinum anglicum, g. bryograptoides,* etc.) with which it is undoubtedly closely and intimately related. Furthermore, confusion will be introduced into early Tremadoc graptolite zonal stratigraphy, for the zone hitherto named after *D. norvegicum,* will become the *D. flabelliforme* zone (or subzone), while the zone known for over a century as the *D. flabelliforme* zone will be given an unfamiliar name.

(ii) For Obut, the taxonomic confusion does not arise because he treats the subspecies mentioned above as species; but even for him the change in stratigraphical nomenclature, and the shift of a name from a zone for which it has so long been used to one for which it has never been used would be confusing.

3. I am therefore convinced that, for the stability of both zoological and stratigraphical nomenclature, the Commission should proceed as proposed by Bulman in 1967. His proposals should be the more easily accepted since the validity of the lectotype is at least open to question.

OPINION 1239
ATTELABUS LINNAEUS, 1758 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers, the designation of *Attelabus curculionoides* Linnaeus, 1767 as type species of the nominal genus *Attelabus* Linnaeus, 1758 by Latreille, 1810, is hereby confirmed.

(2) The generic name *Attelabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Attelabus curculionoides* Linnaeus, 1767, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2177.

(3) The specific name *nitens* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Curculio nitens* (the valid name at the date of this ruling of the type species of *Attelabus* Linnaeus, 1758) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2837.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2209

An application for the designation of a type species for *Attelabus* Linnaeus, 1758 was first received from Dr H. Silfverberg on 13 December 1976. It was sent to the printer on 19 April 1977 and published on 1 November 1977 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, pp. 189–190. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory periodicals, to eight general and seven specialised periodicals. Dr R. T. Thompson (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) supported the application but pointed out that *Attelabus curculionoides* had been first designated as type species of *Attelabus* not by Schönherr, 1823, as stated in the application, but by Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Crust. Arachn. Ins.*, p. 430. No adverse comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 25 February 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, pp. 189–190. At the close of the voting period on 25 May 1982 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Alvarado, Mroczkowski, Starobogatov, Willink, Trjapitzin, Tortonese, Halvorsen, Vokes, Habe, Cogger, Bayer, Brinck, Welch, Sabrosky, Nye, Hahn, Heppell, Kraus

Negative Vote — Lehtinen.

Corliss returned a late affirmative vote. Ride was on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Bernardi, Binder and Dupuis.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'I wonder why the usual formula is not used, viz. suppression of all previous designations of type species and then designation of the species desired. Why is *A. curculionoides* made the type species, and not the one bearing the senior synonym, *C. nitens*?' [These comments were relayed to Dr Silfverberg, who accepted the first (embodied in the ruling) but not the second. R.V.M.].

Hahn: 'As I understand this case, Dr Silfverberg asks only for the designation of a type species for *Attelabus*. He does not expressly ask for the junior synonym *Curculionoides* to be given precedence over the senior synonym *nitens*. It would have been better if this latter species had been designated as type species, since it is cited as such in, e.g., Grzimek's *Tierleben*'.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Attelabus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 387

nitens, Curculio, Scopoli, 1763, *Entomol. Carniolica,* p. 25.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (82)10 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1239.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
23 September 1982

OPINION 1240
HESPERIIDAE LATREILLE, 1809 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA) ADDED TO OFFICIAL LIST

RULING. — (1) The generic name *Hesperia* Fabricius, 1793 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Dalman, 1816, *Papilio comma* Linnaeus, 1758, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2178.

(2) The specific name *comma* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Papilio comma* (specific name of type species of *Hesperia* Fabricius, 1793) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2838.

(3) The family name HESPERIIDAE Latreille, 1809 (as 'Hesperides') (type genus, *Hesperia* Fabricius, 1793) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 548.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2213

An application from Lieutenant-Colonel C. F. Cowan for the placing of HESPERIIDAE Latreille, 1809 on the Official List was first received on 1 February 1977. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 16 February 1978 and published on 31 July 1978 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 55–57. No usage of the plenary powers was involved. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 25 February 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (82)11 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 56. At the close of the voting period on 25 May 1982 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Alvarado, Mroczkowski, Starobogatov, Willink, Trjapitzin, Tortonese, Halvorsen, Vokes, Habe, Cogger, Bayer, Welch, Brinck, Nye, Sabrosky, Hahn, Lehtinen, Heppell

Negative Vote — Kraus.

Corliss returned a late affirmative vote. Ride was on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Bernardi, Binder and Dupuis.

Kraus commented: 'The fact that a name has been used as an example in the Code does not automatically justify its addition to the Official List. No other reason is put forward by the applicant.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
comma, Papilio, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.,* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 484
Hesperia Fabricius, 1793, *Entomol. Syst.,* vol. 3, part 1, p. 258
HESPERIIDAE Latreille, 1809 (as 'Hesperides'), *Genera Crust. Ins.* vol. 4, pp. 187, 207.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)11 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1240.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
23 September 1982

OPINION 1241
CAENOLESTIDAE TROUESSART, 1898 AND PALAEOTHENTIDAE SINCLAIR, 1906 (MAMMALIA): CONSERVED

RULING.— (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the family-group names ABDERITIDAE Ameghino, 1889, GARZONIIDAE Ameghino, 1891, and DECASTIDAE Ameghino, 1893 are not to be given priority over the family-group names CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898 and PALAEOTHENTINAE Sinclair, 1906.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Caenolestes* Thomas, 1895 (gender: masculine), type species, through *Hyracodon* Tomes 1863, *non* Leidy, 1856, *Hyracodon fuliginosus* Tomes, 1863 (Name Number 2179);

(b) *Palaeothentes* Ameghino, 1887 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Clemens & Marshall, 1976, *Palaeothentes aratae* Ameghino, 1887, (Name Number 2180);

(c) *Abderites* Ameghino, 1887 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Abderites meridionalis* Ameghino, 1887 (Name Number 2181);

(d) *Garzonia* Ameghino, 1891 (gender: feminine), type species, under Article 68b, *Garzonia typica* Ameghino, 1891 (currently treated as a junior subjective synonym of *Stilotherium* Ameghino, 1887) (Name Number 2182);

(e) *Decastis* Ameghino, 1891 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Decastis columnaris* Ameghino, 1891 (currently treated as a junior subjective synonym of *Dipilus* Ameghino, 1890) (Name Number 2183).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *fuliginosus* Tomes, 1863, as published in the binomen *Hyracodon fuliginosus* (specific name of type species of *Caenolestes* Thomas, 1895) (Name Number 2839);

(b) *aratae* Ameghino, 1887, as published in the binomen *Palaeothentes aratae* (specific name of type species of *Palaeothentes* Ameghino, 1887) (Name Number 2840);

(c) *meridionalis* Ameghino, 1887, as published in the binomen *Abderites meridionalis* (specific name of type species of *Abderites* Ameghino, 1887) (Name Number 2841);

(d) *typica* Ameghino, 1891, as published in the binomen *Garzonia typica* (specific name of type species of *Garzonia* Ameghino, 1891) (Name Number 2842);

(e) *columnaris* Ameghino, 1891, as published in the binomen

Decastis columnaris (specific name of type species of *Decastis* Ameghino, 1891) (Name Number 2843).

(4) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the endorsements and Name Numbers specified:

(a) CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898 (type genus *Caenolestes* Thomas, 1895) to be given nomenclatural precedence over ABDERITIDAE Ameghino, 1889, GARZONIIDAE Ameghino, 1891 and DECASTIDAE Ameghino, 1893 (Name Number 549);

(b) PALAEOTHENTINAE Sinclair, 1906 (type genus *Palaeothentes* Ameghino, 1887) to be given nomenclatural precedence over ABDERTIDAE Ameghino, 1889, GARZONIIDAE Ameghino, 1891 and DECASTIDAE Ameghino, 1893 (Name Number 550);

(c) ABDERITINAE Ameghino, 1889 (type genus *Abderites* Ameghino, 1887), not to be given priority over CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898 or PALAEOTHENTIDAE Sinclair, 1906 (Name Number 551);

(d) GARZONIIDAE Ameghino, 1891 (type genus, *Garzonia* Ameghino, 1891), not to be given priority over CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898 or PALAEOTHENTIDAE Sinclair, 1906 (Name Number 552);

(e) DECASTIDAE Ameghino, 1893 (type genus *Decastis* Ameghino, 1891), not to be given priority over CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898 or PALAEOTHENTIDAE Sinclair, 1906 (Name Number 553).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.) 2214

An application concerning a number of family-group names of South American mammals was first received from Dr Larry G. Marshall (*Princeton University, U.S.A.*) in his own name and that of Dr Richard H. Tedford (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) on 2 February 1977. After an exchange of correspondence a revised application was sent to the printer on 16 February 1978 and published on 31 July 1978 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 58–64. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given to the statutory journals, to seven general periodicals and two specialist periodicals. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 25 February 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)12 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 61–63. At the close of the voting period on 25 May 1982 the state of the voting

was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Alvarado, Mroczkowski, Starobogatov, Willink, Trjapitzin, Tortonese, Halvorsen, Vokes, Habe, Bayer, Welch, Brinck, Nye, Hahn, Kraus

Negative Votes—four (4): Holthuis, Sabrosky, Heppell, Lehtinen.

Cogger abstained. Corliss sent in a late affirmative vote. Ride was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Binder and Dupuis.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'Evidently the classification of the group is not settled. Also usage seems not to be uniform (para 4). A strict application of the Law of Priority might be best in such a case. Is not the correct spelling of DECASTIDAE DECASTIDIDAE?'. [To this last point the honorary classical adviser, Mr C. W. Wright, replied: 'I can find no evidence that *Decastis* is a Latin or Greek word (like you I suspect that it was formed from a personal name) so its stem must be decided by analogy. The majority of Latin nouns ending in -is have a grammatical stem in -i; in the present instance the grammatical stem would be *decasti-* and the genitive singular *decast-is*. The family name would thus be DECASTIDAE. Similar instances are *avis* and *collis* in Table 2 of Appendix D to the Code. Common Latin nouns ending in -stis that would give the same result are *hostis, fustis, postis.* Only rather few Latin nouns ending in -is have a stem ending in -d like *lapis, lapidis,* would give LAPIDIDAE. I have no hesitation in advising that *Decastis* produced the family name DECASTIDAE']

Cogger: 'I abstain from voting on this proposal: there are insufficient data in the application.'

Sabrosky: 'Sinclair, 1906, erred several times in using the youngest name over several senior synonyms and I cannot agree to approve that. From the facts submitted, it appears that EPANORTHIDAE has the best claim for retention (Thomas, 1895; Osborn, 1910; Winge, 1923; Scott, 1937). *Epanorthis* and EPANORTHIDAE have nomenclatural status of their own, even though the former was an unnecessary replacement name.'

Heppell: 'The statement by the applicants that "... EPANORTHIDAE is invalid because it is based on *Epanorthus,* an invalid replacement name" does not seem to be supported by Article 40. I might support an alternative solution to the applicants' problems, if one less nomenclaturally cumbersome could be devised, but I suspect there are too many "taxonomic concepts that are quite unacceptable" offered here in the guise of nomenclature. I would have preferred to leave this and other such cases until after the discussion of general problems of family-group names at the Commission's meeting in Ottawa.' [Owing to pressure of time, this subject was not discussed at Ottawa. R.V.M.].

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Abderites Ameghino, 1887, *Bol. Mus. de la Plata,* vol. 1, p. 5

ABDERITIDAE Ameghino, 1889, *Actas Acad. Cienc. Cordoba,* vol. 6, pp. 268, 269

aratae, Palaeothentes, Ameghino, 1887, *Bol. Mus. de la Plata,* vol. 1, p. 5

Caenolestes Thomas, 1895, *Proc. zool. Soc. London* for 1895, p. 875

CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898, *Catalogus Mammalium tam viventium quam fossilium,* new ed., Berlin, p. 1205

columnaris, Decastis, Ameghino, 1891, *Rev. arg. Hist. nat.,* vol. 1, p. 305

Decastis Ameghino, 1891, *Rev. arg. Hist. nat.,* vol. 1, p. 19

DECASTIDAE Ameghino, 1893, *Rev. gen. Sci.* (Paris), vol. 4, p. 79

fuliginosus, Hyracodon, Tomes, 1863, *Proc. zool. Soc. London* for 1863, pl. 8, p. 51

Garzonia Ameghino, 1891, *Rev. arg. Hist. nat.,* vol. 1, p. 21

GARZONIIDAE Ameghino, 1891, *Rev. arg. Hist. nat.,* vol. 1, pp. 304, 307

meridionalis, Abderites, Ameghino, 1887, *Bol. Mus. de la Plata,* vol. 1, p. 5

Palaeothentes Ameghino, 1887, *Bol. Mus. de la Plata,* vol. 1, p. 5

PALAEOTHENTIDAE Sinclair, 1906, *Rep. Princeton Univ. Exped. Patagonia,* vol. 4, p. 417

typica, Garzonia, Ameghino, 1891, *Rev. arg. Hist. nat.,* vol. 1, p. 307

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)12 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1241.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
27 September 1982

OPINION 1242
CATAPHRYXUS SHIINO, 1936 (CRUSTACEA, ISOPODA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the generic name *Epiphryxus* Shiino, 1934, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Epiphrixus* Nierstrasz & Brender à Brandis, 1932 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Epiphrixus adriaticus* Nierstrasz & Brender à Brandis, 1932 (Name Number 2184);

(b) *Cataphryxus* Shiino, 1936 (gender: masculine), type species, through *Epiphryxus* Shiino, 1934, *Epiphryxus primus* Shiino, 1934 (Name Number 2185).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *adriaticus* Nierstrasz & Brender à Brandis, 1932, as published in the binomen *Epiphrixus adriaticus* (specific name of type species of *Epiphrixus* Nierstrasz & Brender à Brandis, 1932) (Name Number 2844);

(b) *primus* Shiino, 1934, as published in the binomen *Epiphryxus primus* (specific name of type species of *Cataphryxus* Shiino, 1936) (Name Number 2845).

(4) The generic name *Epiphryxus* Shiino, 1934, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names with the Name Number 2132.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2217

An application for the conservation of *Cataphryxus* Shiino, 1936 was first received from Dr John C. Markham (*Bermuda Biological Station*) on 24 February 1977. It was sent to the printer on 19 April 1977 and published on 1 November 1977 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, pp. 191–192. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin,* to seven general periodicals and to one specialist periodical. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 25 February 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)13 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, p. 192.

At the close of the voting period on 25 May 1982 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20): Melville, Holthuis, Alvarado, Mroczkowski, Starobogatov, Willink, Trjapitzin, Tortonese, Halvorsen, Vokes, Habe, Brinck, Bayer, Welch, Nye, Sabrosky, Hahn, Lehtinen, Heppell, Kraus

Negative Votes — none (0).

Corliss returned a late affirmative vote. Ride was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Binder, Cogger and Dupuis.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

adriaticus, Epiphrixus, Nierstrasz & Brender à Brandis, 1932, *Zool. Anz.*, vol. 101, p. 99

Cataphryxus Shiino, 1936, *Mem. Coll. Sci. Kyoto imp. Univ.* (B), vol. 11, pp. 172–173

Epiphrixus Nierstrasz & Brender à Brandis, 1932, *Zool. Anz.*, vol. 101, p. 99

Epiphryxus Shiino, 1934, *Mem. Coll. Sci. Kyoto imp. Univ.*, (B), vol. 9, p. 281

primus, Epiphryxus, Shiino, 1934, *Mem. Coll. Sci. Kyoyo imp. Univ.* (B), vol. 9, pp. 281–283.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)13 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1242.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
28 September 1982

OPINION 1243
ERINACEUS DAUURICUS SUNDEVALL, 1842 (MAMMALIA, INSECTIVORA) CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the specific name *Erinaceus dauuricus* Sundevall, 1842 is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific name *Erinaceus sibiricus* Erxleben, 1777 whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *sibiricus* Erxleben, 1777, as published in the binomen *Erinaceus sibiricus,* with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Erinaceus dauuricus* Sundevall, 1842 whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2846);

(b) *dauuricus* Sundevall, 1842, as published in the binomen *Erinaceus dauuricus,* with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *Erinaceus sibiricus* Erxleben, 1777 whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2847).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2222

An application from Dr G. B. Corbet for the conservation of *Erinaceus dauuricus* Sundevall, 1842 was first received on 18 May 1977. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 16 February 1978 and published on 31 October 1978 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 125–126. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory periodicals, to eight general periodicals and two specialised periodicals. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 25 February 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (1982)14 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 124. At the close of the voting period on 25 May 1982 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Alvarado, Mroczkowski, Starobogatov, Willink, Trjapitzin, Tortonese, Vokes, Halvorsen, Habe, Cogger, Brinck, Bayer, Welch, Nye, Lehtinen, Hahn, Kraus

Negative Votes — two (2): Sabrosky, Heppell.

Ride was on leave of absence. Corliss returned a late affirmative vote. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Binder and Dupuis.

Heppell commented: 'Since Erxleben's *E. sibiricus* description was accompanied by six other references apart from those to Seba (who has two figures not explicitly of the same specimen) it seems somewhat tendentious to regard the single specimen which was in Mus. Seba, now in the British Museum (Natural History), as the holotype of Erxleben's species, even though it may be probable that all the subsequent references are derived from Seba's original. I could accept the addition of *E. sibiricus* to the Official List (if necessary with acceptance of Seba's specimen as the type) as the valid name for *E. dauuricus*, or to the Official Index in order to protect the latter name, but not the present inelegant arrangement.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

dauuricus, Erinaceus, Sundevall, 1842, *K. svenska Vetenskaps Akad. Handl.* for 1841, p. 237

sibiricus, Erinaceus, Erxleben, 1777, *Syst. regn. anim.* p. 172.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)14 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1243.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
28 September 1982

OPINION 1244
STETHASPIS HOPE, 1837 (COLEOPTERA, SCARABAEIDAE): DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES

RULING. — (1) The nominal species *Melolontha suturalis* Fabricius, 1775, is hereby designated as type species of the nominal genus *Stethaspis* Hope, 1837.

(2) The generic name *Stethaspis* Hope, 1837 (gender: feminine), type species, under the ruling given in (1) above, *Melolontha suturalis* Fabricius, 1775, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2133.

(3) The specific name *suturalis* Fabricius, 1775, as published in the binomen *Melolontha suturalis* (specific name of type species of *Stethaspis* Hope, 1837) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2848.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2130

An application for the resolution of confusion between the generic names *Costleya* and *Costelytra* (for genera within the same subfamily of Coleoptera) was first received from Dr J. C. Watt (*Mt Albert Research Centre, Auckland, New Zealand*) on 10 July 1975. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 29 March 1977 and published on 31 August 1977 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, pp. 85–87. Although the plenary powers were not invoked by the applicant, one of the possible solutions to the problem would have entailed their use. Public notice of this possibility was therefore given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory periodicals, and to seven general and seven entomological periodicals. The application was supported by Dr R. D. Pope (*British Museum (Natural History), London).* No adverse comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 25 February 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)16 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, p. 87. At the close of the voting period on 25 May 1982 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Alvarado, Mroczkowski, Starobogatov, Willink, Trjapitzin, Tortonese, Halvorsen, Vokes, Habe, Bayer, Brinck, Welch, Sabrosky, Nye, Lehtinen, Heppell, Kraus

Negative Votes — Hahn.

Ride was on leave of absence. Corliss returned a late affirmative vote. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Binder, Cogger and Dupuis.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their votes:

Sabrosky: 'The application seems unnecessarily complex. Paragraphs 5 and 7 (on *Poecilodiscus* and *Neostethaspis*) are irrelevant to the main issue. In paragraph 10, the applicant's first possibility, that *Xylonychus eucalypti* might be designated as type species of *Stethaspis* would in fact require the use of the plenary powers. However, I do not disagree with the purpose of the application and vote to confirm *M. suturalis* as type species of *Stethaspis*.'

Hahn:'*Costelytra* and *Costleya* are not very similar names. If the Commission follows Dr Watt's proposal, many other names might also be changed.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Stethaspis Hope, 1837, *Coleopt. Man.*, p. 105

suturalis, Melolontha, Fabricius, 1775, *Syst. Entomol.*, p. 34.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)16 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1244.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
28 September 1982

OPINION 1245
LINYPHIA TENEBRICOLA WIDER, 1834 (ARACHNIDA) TO BE INTERPRETED IN THE SENSE OF KULCZYNSKI, 1887

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers, the type material of *Linyphia tenebricola* Wider, 1834, is hereby set aside and the neotype proposed by Locket, Millidge & van Helsdingen, 1978, is hereby accepted.

(2) The specific name *tenebricola* Wider, 1834, as published in the binomen *Linyphia tenebricola,* and as interpreted by reference to the neotype accepted under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2849.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2143

An application for the stabilisation of the specific name *Linyphia tenebricola* Wider, 1834, in the sense of Kulczynski, 1887 was first received on 18 August 1975 from Dr P. J. van Helsdingen, on behalf of himself, Mr Locket and Mr Millidge. The application was stated to be the result of an opinion poll among arachnologists expected to have an opinion, from which it appeared that most were in favour of the solution proposed. After an exchange of correspondence, the application was sent to the printer on 12 September 1977 and published on 31 January 1978 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 44–46. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, and to eight general serials. The application was supported by Professor Herbert W. Levi (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, U.S.A.*). No adverse comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 25 February 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)5 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 45–46. At the close of the voting period on 25 May 1982 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Alvarado, Mroczkowski, Starobogatov, Willink, Tortonese, Trjapitzin, Halvorsen, Vokes, Habe, Brinck, Welch, Nye, Sabrosky, Bayer, Hahn, Lehtinen, Heppell, Kraus

Negative Votes — none (0).

Ride was on leave of absence. Corliss returned a late affirmative vote. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Binder, Cogger and Dupuis.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Hahn: 'If the Commission follows the proposals, not only *L. tenebricola* but also *L. mengei* will be preserved in the sense of Kulczynski, 1887. Why, then, should only the first and not the second specific name be placed on the Official List?'

Lehtinen: 'I support the proposals but find them incomplete. *Lepthyphantes mengei* Kulczynski, 1887 also needs an unambiguous type specimen, if we reject the type material of Wider, 1834. If we want to stabilise the nomenclature of either of these species we should do so for both.'

These comments were passed on to Mr Locket, who consulted his colleagues. It was found impossible to make contact with the zoologists in charge of the Kulczynski collection in Warsaw. In consequence, Mr Locket wrote to me on 3 November 1982 to urge that the *L. tenebricola* case be concluded and that the case of *L. mengei* be considered separately when the type material of that species could be examined. The present Opinion has therefore been prepared without further delay.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to a name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

tenebricola, Linyphia Wider, 1834, *Mus. Senckenberg* (*Abh. Gebiete beschr. Naturges. von Mitgl. senck. naturk. Ges. in Frankfurt-am-Main*), vol. 1, pp. 260–261, pl. 18, figs. 2a, 2b.

Lepthyphantes tenebricola (Wider), (Kulczynski, 1887), *Rozpr. Spraw. Wydz. mat.-przyrod. Akad. Umiej.* vol. 16, pp. 321–322, pl. 7, figs. 34–36.

The following is the original proposal of a neotype for *Linyphia tenebricola* Wider, 1834: a female from O. Taunus: bei Ebersgöns (Kr. Wetzlar) (O. & M. Kraus, XI, 1960), Natur-Museum Senckenberg, Frankfurt. See *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 35, p. 45.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)5 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1245.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
9 November 1982

PSEUDOPONTIA PLÖTZ *v. GONOPHLEBIA* FELDER (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): SETTLEMENT OF CASE. Z.N.(S.)1688

(see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 22, page 104)

By C. F. Cowan, (*4 Thornfield Terrace, Grange-over-Sands, Cumbria, LA11 7DR, England*)

This problem has settled itself. Briefly, and with some minor additions in clarification, the trouble was that two authors, independently and almost simultaneously, proposed new generic and specific names for a very interesting insect from West Africa. They were:

Globiceps paradoxa C. & R. Felder, 15 Oct. 1869. *Petites Nouv. Ent.* vol. 1(8), pp. [30–31], and

Pseudopontia calabarica Plötz, 1870. *Ent. Ztg. Stettin,* vol. 31(7–9), p. 348, plate 2, figs. 1a–f.

2. The former publication was a monthly or occasionally fortnightly journal whose pages were not numbered until vol. 1(14), p. 49. In the number for 15 November 1869, vol. 1(10), [p. 37], it was correctly pointed out that *Globiceps* was a preoccupied name, and on 15 June 1870, vol. 1(24), p. 95, R. Felder introduced a replacement generic name in the form *Gonophlebia (Globiceps) paradoxa,* under a figure and adding some comments.

3. The second publication was a nominal quarterly (more familiarly known as *Stettiner ent. Ztg.*), and it was logical to infer that the Plötz name dated from September, 1870, especially since the title page of Part (7–9) also bears the dates (Jul.–Sept. 1870), and was junior by 2 or 3 months to *Gonophlebia* Felder. Yet the insect has always been, and still universally is, known as *Pseudopontia paradoxa* (Felder). Hence the application, drafted by Hemming before his death in February 1964 and published fifteen months after it.

4. Aurivillius (1899), p. 386 (*K. svenska VetenskAkad. Handl.*, vol. 31(5), a work better known as *Rhopalocera Aethiopica* and always misdated by its title date '1898' whereas publication is shown on its last page (p. 561) to have been after 'Ende April 1899') firmly gave *Pseudopontia* Plötz, (April) 1870 priority over *Gonophlebia* Felder, June 1870. Expecting that 'April' was the date of submission of Plötz's paper, a check was made. Aurivillius proved correct. His paper was not dated and his plate, a shared one, was 'Lith. von Prittwitz 1868'; nine other papers were dated, all between Oct. 1869 and Feb. 1870. Finally, on the last page—p. 360 of Number (7–9) (July–Sept. 1870)—is the publication date 'Ausgegeben Mitte April'. The two previous numbers, vol. 31 (1–3) and (4–6) were similarly published early; respectively at 'Anfang Nov. 1869' and 'Mitte Feb. 1870' (p. 128 and p. 264). Perhaps the Editor, Dr Dohrn, cleared those issues early so that he could work on the 8 years' summary and index of 64 pages which concluded volume

31. In any case, the general and prevalent usage of the name *Pseudopontia* shows that the situation was well understood in those days. The well documented reports of the monthly meetings of the Entomological Society of London published in *Proc. Entomol. Soc. London* 1869, 1870 fully confirm the relevant dates:

Entomol. Ztg. Stettin	Received in London between	see *Proc. Entomol. Soc. Lond.*
Vol. 30(7–12) & 31(1–3)	15 Nov.–1 Dec.	1869: xxvii, para 2 line 4
31(4–6)	7 Mar.–21 Mar.	1870: xii, last 2 lines
31(7–9)	2 May–6 June	1870: xxiii, para 2 line 6
31('9'–12)	6 July–7 Nov.	1870: xxxii, line 8

5. I would like to thank Mrs Brenda G. Leonard, Librarian of the Royal Entomological Society of London, for her patient and able help in answering tiresome questions on this and related problems.

6. The interlocking synonymy of the taxa is:

Pseudopontia Plötz, (April) 1870. *Entomol. Ztg. Stettin,* vol. 31(7–9), p. 348. Type species by monotypy *P. calabarica* Plötz, 1870. *ibid.,* p. 348, pl. 2, fig. 1 (a junior subjective synonym of *G. paradoxa* Felder, q.v. *infra*)

= *Globiceps* Felder, 1869 (invalid homonym; *vide infra*)

= *Gonophlebia* Felder, June 1870. *Petites Nouv. Ent.* vol. 1(24), p. 95.

Globiceps paradoxa C. & R. Felder, Oct. 1869. *Petites Nouv. Ent.* vol. 1(8), [pp. 30–31].

7. No action by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested, beyond publication of the present note for general information and record.

REQUEST FOR A RULING TO CORRECT HOMONYMY IN NAMES OF THE FAMILY-GROUPS BASED ON *MYRMECIA* (INSECTA) AND *MYRMECIUM* (ARACHNIDA). Z.N.(S.)2223

By Jonathan Reiskind (*Department of Zoology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, U.S.A.*)

When homonymy exists between family-group names based on similar but not identical names of type genera, the case is to be referred to the International Commission (1964, International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, Art. 55a). A case of homonymy involves the family-group name MYRMECIINAE, in use both in Insecta (Hymenoptera) and Arachnida (Araneae).

2. *Myrmecia* Fabricius, 1804, is the type genus of the family MYRMECIIDAE Emery, 1877. This taxon (the name is in current use as a subfamily, MYRMECIINAE), the 'bulldog' ants of Australia and New Caledonia, consists of two genera and 66 described species (Brown & Taylor, 1970).

3. *Myrmecium* Latreille, 1824, is the type genus of the family-group taxon first named as MYRMECIDES C. L. Koch, 1851. Keyserling (1891) first used the name with the proper Latin termination as the subfamily MYRMECIINAE. Despite the fact that since 1897 MYRMECIINAE has been a senior subjective synonym of MICARIINAE Simon, 1897, it has never replaced the latter name which has been in wide use until recently when the type genus of the subfamily, *Micaria* Westring, 1851, was transferred to the family GNAPHOSIDAE leaving at least 15 genera belonging to this subfamily of the CLUBIONIDAE (Reiskind, 1969). The only family-group name among these remaining genera was MYRMECIINAE C. L. Koch, 1851, a senior homonym of MYRMECIINAE Emery, 1877. The prevalent application of this family name to the Australian ant taxon prompted the reviser (Reiskind, 1969, p. 179) to propose a new family-group name, CASTIANEIRINAE, for this subfamily as a substitute. Yet this name is a junior subjective synonym of MYRMECIINAE C. L. Koch and hence not valid. Since this family-group name is well established for the ant subfamily it is proposed here that the name MYRMECIINAE C. L. Koch be modified to MYRMECIUMINAE. This would have to be done under the plenary powers. While this is not a grammatically proper solution the new name is sufficiently distinct to avoid confusion and stabilise the nomenclature.

4. For the above reasons the International Commission is requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the stem of the generic name *Myrmecium* Latreille, 1824 for the purposes of Article 29 is MYRMECIUM-;

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Myrmecia* Fabricius, 1804 (gender: feminine), type species by designation of Wheeler, 1911 (p. 168), *Formica gulosa* Fabricius, 1775;
   (b) *Myrmecium* Latreille, 1824 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Myrmecium rufum* Latreille, 1824;

(3) to place the following species names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *gulosa* Fabricius, 1775, as published in the binomen *Formica gulosa* (specific name of type species of *Myrmecia* Fabricius, 1804);
   (b) *rufum* Latreille, 1824, as published in the binomen *Myrmecium rufum* (specific name of type species of *Myrmecium* Latreille, 1824);

(4) to place the following family-group names on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:
   (a) MYRMECIIDAE Emery, 1877 (type genus *Myrmecia* (Fabricius, 1804);
   (b) MYRMECIUMIDAE (emend. under the plenary powers of MYRMECIIDAE) C. L. Koch, 1851 (type genus *Myrmecium* Latreille, 1824).

REFERENCES

BROWN, W. L., Jr & TAYLOR, W. R. 1970. Superfamily FORMICOIDEA in *Insects of Australia* (Melbourne University Press), pp. 951–959.
EMERY, C. 1877. *Boll. Soc. ent. Italiana,* vol. 9, p. 73.
FABRICIUS, J. C. 1775. *Systema Entomologiae,* p. 395.
———1804. *Syst. Piez.* (1804), p. 423.
KEYSERLING, E. 1891. *Die Spinnen Amerikas.* Brasilianischen Spinnen, vol. 3, p. 78.
KOCH, C. L. 1851. *Uebersicht des Arachnidensystems,* vol. 5, p. 41.
LATREILLE, P. A. 1824. *Ann. Sci. nat. (Zool.),* vol. 3, pp. 26, 27.
REISKIND, J. 1969. *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harvard,* vol. 138(5), pp. 163–325.
SIMON, E. 1897. *Hist. nat. Araignées,* vol. 2, p. 153.
WESTRING, N. 1851. *Göteborgs Kongl. Vetenskaps Handl.,* vol. 2, p. 47.
WHEELER, W. M. 1911. *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.,* vol. 21, pp. 157–175.

ON FAMILY GROUP NAMES BASED UPON *EURHIN, EURHINUS* AND *EURHYNCHUS* (COLEOPTERA). Z.N.(S.)2269

(1) By E. C. Zimmerman (*Division of Entomology, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, P.O. Box 1700, Canberra City, A.C.T. 2601, Australia*)

Difficult problems arise concerning the formation of family-group names based upon *Eurhin, Eurhinus* and *Eurhynchus.* It appears to have escaped general notice that there are now in curculionid literature homonymous family-group names based upon *Eurhinus.* Casey, 1922, vol. 10, p. 417, used EURHININI as a tribal name in the BARIDINAE, and Kissinger, 1968, p. 10 used EURHININI as a tribal name in the APIONINAE.

2. The facts are as follows:

In the APIONIDAE (or APIONINAE) there is the following:

EURHYNUS Kirby, 1819 (1818), vol. 12, p. 427, as a spelling error in the body of the original description;

Eurhynchus Kirby & Spence, 1828, vol. 3, p. 324, an unjustified emendation for *Eurhinus* and a junior homonym of *Eurhynchus* Berthold, 1827 (Aves);

Eurhynchus Schoenherr, 1833, vol. 1(1), p. 247, an unjustified replacement name for *Eurhinus* Kirby and a junior homonym of *Eurhynchus* Berthold and *Eurhynchus* Kirby & Spence.

Eurrhinus, as a misspelling by Marshall, 1952, p. 268.

3. Any family-group name based upon this genus should be formed upon *Eurhinus.* The homonyms *Eurhynchus* Kirby & Spence and *Eurhynchus* Schoenherr were both 'stillborn' and cannot be used in the formation of family-group names.

4. In 1863, p. 380, p. 527, Lacordaire proposed the family group name 'Eurhynchides' based upon the homonym *Eurhynchus* Schoenherr. For the reasons of homonymy noted above, 'Eurhynchides' is an invalid form. The name should have been 'Eurhinides', based upon the valid *Eurhinus* Kirby. Kissinger, 1968, p. 10, noting the homonymy of *Eurhynchus*, used 'Tribe EURHININI Kissinger, new name'. In doing so, Kissinger created a homonym of EURHININI Casey, 1922, in the Baridinae, as noted below.

5. In the BARIDINAE there is the following:

Eurhin Illiger, 1807a, vol. 6, p. 309;

Eurhin Illiger, 1807b, vol. 6, p. 326;

Eurhinus Schoenherr, 1826, p. 312, as an emendation of *Eurhin* and a homonym of *Eurhinus* Kirby, 1819;

Macrorhine [vernacular] Latreille, 1825, p. 395. Synonymy by Lacordaire, 1866, vol. 7, p. 221, footnote 1, as *Macrorhinus.*

6. In 1866, vol. 7, p. 217, p. 220, Lacordaire proposed the family-group name 'Eurhinides', in the BARIDINAE, based upon the homonym *Eurhinus* Schoenherr instead of *Eurhin* Illiger. Because *Eurhinus* and *Eurhin* both have the same stem, *eurhin–*, each would give the form 'Eurhinides'. Hence, 'Eurhinides', EURHININA and EURHININI are valid names only in the BARIDINAE. Pierce, 1916, p. 472, proposed the subfamily name EURHININAE. Casey, 1922, p. 417, used the tribal name EURHININI. Hustache, 1938, p. 24 used the subtribal name EURHININA.

7. The acceptance of the family-group name EURHININI in the BARIDINAE renders the 'Eurhinini' presently in the APIONIDAE without a valid name. It is necessary, therefore, to circumvent the fact that the stem of both *Eurhin* and *Eurhinus* is the same, and the stem *eurhin–* cannot be used outside of the Baridinae where it has priority.

8. Because an impossible situation arises if the normal rules of compounding names are followed, an arbitrary decision appears to be required. Hence, it is suggested that the entire name *Eurhinus* Kirby be used as a stem to form Eurhinusina, Eurhinusini, Eurhinusinae and Eurhinusidae. Such action would agree with the example given in the Code under Article 55 where '*Merope* (Insecta) and *Merops* (Aves) each formed the basis of a family name MEROPIDAE. To overcome the homonymy, the Commission ruled that *Merope* should form the family name MEROPEIDAE (Opinion 140)'.

9. The Commission is requested to give a binding decision regarding the problem of family-group names based upon *Eurhin* and *Eurhinus,* by accepting *Eurhinus-* as the stem for the four taxa cited in the paragraph above.

REFERENCES

CASEY, T. L. 1922. *Memoirs on the Coleoptera,* vol. 10, pp. 1–520.

HUSTACHE, A. 1938. Curculionidae: Barinae. In: W. Junk's *Coleopterorum Catalogus*, Pars 163, pp. 1–219.

ILLIGER, J. C. W. 1807a. Nachlese zu den Bermerkungen, Berichtigungen und Zusätzen zu Fabricii Systema Eleutheratorum. *Magazin für Insektenkunde,* vol. 6, pp. 296–317.

——— 1807b. Vorschlag zur Aufnahme im Fabricischen Systeme fehlender Käfergattungen. *Magazin für Insektenkunde*, vol. 6, pp. 318–349.

KIRBY, W. F. 1819 [1818]. A Century of Insects, including several new Genera described from his Cabinet. *Trans. Linn. Soc. London,* vol. 12, pp. 375–453, col. pls. 21–22.

——— & SPENCE, W. 1928. *An Introduction to Entomology*, Ed. 5, vol. 3, pp. 1–731.

KISSINGER, D. 1968. *Curculionidae. Subfamily Apioninae of North and Central America.* i-vii, pp. 1–559, figs. 1–221.

LACORDAIRE, J. T. 1863. Curculionides. In: *Histoire Naturelle des Insectes— Genera des Coléoptères,* vol. 6, pp. 1–637.

——— 1866. Ibid. vol. 7, pp. 1–620, col. pls. 61–80.
LATREILLE, P. A. 1825. *Familles naturelles du Règne Animal*, pp. 1–570.
MARSHALL, G. 1952. Taxonomic Notes on Curculionidae. *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (xii) vol. 5, pp. 261–270.
PIERCE, W. 1916. Studies of Weevils (Rhynchophora) with Descriptions of New Genera and Species. *Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus.* vol. 51, pp. 461–473, figs. 1–2.
SCHOENHERR, C. J. 1826. *Curculionidum Dispositio Methodica* —, pp. i–x, pp. 1–338.
——— 1833. *Genera et Species Curculionidum* —, vol. 1(1), pp. i–xv, pp. 1–381.

(2) By R. T. Thompson (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

The name *Eurhinus* has been used for each of two distantly related genera of weevils (Curculionoidea) and homonymous family-group names have been based on this name in the two groups concerned. One of the two genera belongs to the CURCULIONIDAE-BARIDINAE and is usually known by the name *Eurhinus* Schönherr. It comprises some 23 species (P. Vaurie, pers. comm.) which are widely distributed in Central and South America. Several species are notable for their brilliant metallic colours. The larvae produce galls on the stems of Vitaceae (*Cissus spp.*) (Bondar, 1948, p. 21; Costa Lima, 1956, p. 231). The other genus is generally regarded as belonging to the APIONIDAE and was, until recently, known by the name *Eurhynchus* Schönherr. It comprises some ten Australian species whose habits are mostly unknown, though one species has been reported tunnelling in the stem of *Persoonia lanceolata* (Proteaceae) (Froggatt, 1895, p. 328). Neither *Eurhinus* Schönherr nor *Eurhynchus* Schönherr is the original name for the genus concerned.

2. The earliest name for the barid genus is *Eurhin* Illiger, 1807; that for the apionid genus is *Eurhinus* Kirby, 1819. Germar, 1824, p. 216, used *Eurhinus* as an alternative form of *Eurhin* and pointed out that the former name had already been used by Kirby. Schönherr, 1825, p. 586, apparently unaware of the works of Kirby and Germar, created absolute homonymy by emending Illiger's name to *Eurhinus*. Several attempts to remove this homonymy have been made.

(a) Latreille, 1825, p. 395, proposed 'Macrorhine' as a replacement name for '*eurin* Germ.' (having cited *'Eurhine'* [Kirby] on p. 388). This vernacular name is not available but Berthold, in a German edition of Latreille, 1825 (1827, p. 390) gave '*Macrorhinus* (*Eurin* oder *Eurhinus*, Germ.)'. This name is available as a replacement name for *Eurhinus* Schönherr. It is cited as a synonym of the latter by Schönherr, 1836, p. 812; Guérin-Méneville, 1857, p. 209; Lacordaire, 1866, p. 221, note 1; Gemminger & Harold,

1871, p. 2619; Casey, 1922, p. 417; Hustache, 1938, p. 25; and Blackwelder, 1947, p. 891, all of whom attribute the name to Latreille, not Berthold. This name was probably not adopted because *Eurhynchus* Schönherr, 1833 (see (d) below) made it unnecessary.

(b) Kirby, in Kirby & Spence, 1828, p. 324, proposed *Eurhynchus* expressly as a replacement name for *Eurhinus* Kirby, nec *Eurhin* Illiger. This name is buried in the text and was long overlooked (see (e) below).

(c) Latreille, in Cuvier, 1829, p. 86, proposed *Camptorhynchus* as a further replacement name for *Eurhinus* Schönherr nec Kirby and it is used as the valid name in subsequent editions of *Règne animal.* This name is available as a replacement name (*Camptorhynchus* Fischer de Waldheim, 1808 is a *nomen nudum*) but is a senior homonym of *Camptorhynchus* Bonaparte, 1838 (Aves).

(d) Schönherr, 1833, pp. 5, 247, proposed *Eurhynchus* expressly as a replacement name for *Eurhinus* Kirby nec Illiger. This name was accepted and remained in use until 1952. Unfortunately, however, it is a junior homonym both of a Latreille avian name (1825, p. 76), which was made available by Berthold, 1827, p. 74 (cf. (a) above), and of *Eurhynchus* Kirby, 1828 ((b) above). However, since *Eurhinus* Kirby would not now be regarded as a homonym of *Eurhin* Illiger, the former does not need to be replaced.

(e) Marshall, 1952, p. 268, observed that *'Eurrhinus* Kirby' is valid because *Eurhynchus* Kirby is a junior homonym and was, in any case, proposed 'without any justification'. Presumably he meant by this that *Eurhinus* Kirby is not homonymous with *Eurhin* Illiger (as stated by Kirby) and so the latter is the valid name for the barid genus. There is, however, no evidence, published or otherwise, to confirm this. On the contrary, whereas Marshall annotated his working copy of the Junk catalogue to show the validity of *Eurhinus* Kirby (Wagner, 1910, p. 3), he did not so annotate the entry for *Eurhin* Illiger (Hustache, 1938, p. 25) and specimens of the latter which he received in May 1953 were determined as '*Eurrhinus festivus* F.' and '*Eurrhinus* sp.' (CIE list No. 909 (America), issued 19th May 1955). Although *Eurrhinus* Marshall is available as a replacement name for *Eurhinus* Kirby, it is clear that Marshall did not intend it as such; he invariably used the -rrh- spelling in preference to -rh- in compound names.

3. Family-group names were proposed by Lacordaire: Eurhynchides (1863, pp. 380, 527) and Eurhinides (1866, pp. 217, 220). These names, suitably emended, remained in use for a hundred years, although

both are invalid under Art. 39 of the present Code (their type-genera are junior homonyms). Then Kissinger, in a synoptic work on world APIONIDAE, followed Marshall in using *Eurhinus* Kirby as the valid name of the apionid genus and proposed EURHININI as a new family-group name, correctly based on *Eurhinus* Kirby (Kissinger, 1968, p. 10). He, in turn, was followed by Morimoto, 1976, p. 469. Unfortunately, EURHININI Kissinger is a junior homonym of EURHININI Lacordaire, so there is at present no valid name for either family-group taxon.

The situation, and the proposals for its solution which follow, can best be appreciated by reference to Table I.

Table I. Names involved in the *Eurhinus* problem. Names in use before 1968 in bold type; other available names in ordinary type; unavailable names in italics.

CURCULIONIDAE	APIONIDAE
Eurhin Illiger, 1807	
	Eurhinus Kirby, 1819
	[1]*Eurhynus* Kirby, 1819
[2]*Eurhinus* Germar, 1824	
Eurhinus Schönherr, 1825	
Macrorhinus Berthold, 1827	[Eurhynchus Berthold, 1827 (Aves)]
	Eurhynchus Kirby, 1828
Camptorhynchus Latreille, 1829	
	Eurhynchus Schönherr, 1833
	EURHYNCHIDES Lacordaire, 1863
EURHINIDES Lacordaire, 1866	
	[2]*EURYNCHIDES* Lea, 1909
	Eurrhinus Marshall, 1952
	EURHININI Kissinger, 1968

[1]Incorrect original spelling
[2]Incorrect subsequent spelling

4. Under the provisions of the present Code, *Eurhinus* Kirby is clearly the valid name for the apionid genus and the long-disused, unlatinised *Eurhin* Illiger is valid for the barid genus. For the family-group taxa, entirely new, non-homonymous names would be needed. These could be based upon the valid generic names by artificially changing their stems, or upon names chosen from among the various available replacement names and other synonyms. These changes would destroy the stability of nomenclature which existed from 1866 to 1952 and the transfer of *Eurhinus,* as the valid name, from one group of weevils to another would inevitably cause confusion. These many and undesirable changes can be avoided, stability of nomenclature restored, and homonymy removed, by (1) ruling that Schönherr's emendation of *Eurhin* to *Eurhinus* is justified, so the name then dates from 1807 with Illiger as

author and becomes a senior homonym of *Eurhinus* Kirby, and (2) suppressing *Eurhynchus* Berthold, thus validating *Eurhynchus* Kirby, a now necessary replacement name for *Eurhinus* Kirby nec Illiger. Lacordaire's family-group names are also thereby validated, being now based on valid generic names. *Eurhynchus* Berthold is a junior objective synonym of *Probosciger* Kuhl (Aves, Psittacidae) and has not been used as a senior synonym since its original publication (D. W. Snow, pers. comm.).

5. Other generic names derived from the same Greek root are:
   (a) *Eurina* Meigen, 1830, p. 3, a valid name in Insecta (Diptera, CHLOROPIDAE);
   (b) *Eurhina* Fitzinger, 1843, p. 32, proposed as a subgenus of *Bufo* L. and not subsequently used as a senior synonym (E. N. Arnold, pers. comm.);
   (c) *Eurhina* Agassiz, 1846, p. 150, an unjustified emendation of *Eurina* Meigen and junior homonym of *Eurhina* Fitzinger.

These generic names are not homonymous with those in the present case and no family-group names have been based upon them, but any that are so based will compete in homonymy with EURHININI Lacordaire, 1866.

6. In order to implement the proposals made in paragraph (4) above, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested:
   (1) to use its plenary powers:
      (a) to rule that *Eurhinus* Schönherr, 1825 is a justified emendation of *Eurhin* Illiger, 1807;
      (b) to suppress the generic name *Eurhynchus* Berthold, 1827 for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;
   (2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
      (a) *Eurhinus* Illiger, 1807 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Eurhin cupratus* Illiger, 1807 (as emended by Schönherr, 1825 and ruled under the plenary powers in (1) above to be a justified emendation);
      (b) *Eurhynchus* Kirby, in Kirby & Spence, 1828 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Schönherr, 1833, *Eurhinus scabrior* Kirby, 1819;
   (3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
      (a) *cupratus* Illiger, 1807, as published in the binomen *Eurhin cupratus* (specific name of type species of *Eurhinus* Illiger, 1807);
      (b) *scabrior* Kirby, 1819, as published in the binomen *Eurhinus scabrior* (specific name of type species of *Eurhynchus* Kirby, in Kirby & Spence, 1828);
   (4) to place the following family-group names on the Official

List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:

(a) EURHYNCHINAE (correction of EURHYNCHIDES) Lacordaire, 1863 (type genus *Eurhynchus* Kirby, in Kirby & Stephen, 1828);

(b) EURHININI (correction of EURHINIDES) Lacordaire, 1866 (type genus *Eurhinus* Illiger, 1807);

(5) to place the generic name *Eurhynchus* Berthold, 1827 (as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

In addition to those persons whose assistance is acknowledged in the text, I wish to thank Dr R. B. Madge (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*) for his help in resolving this problem and the Director and staff of the CIE for granting me access to their archives.

This application is supported by Dr G. Kuschel (*Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Auckland, New Zealand*), Dr D. R. Whitehead (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC*), Professor C. W. O'Brien (*Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Fla., U.S.A.*) and by Dr D. G. Kissinger (*Loma Linda University, California, U.S.A.*). Shortly before her death in March, 1982, Mrs P. Vaurie submitted for publication a revision of the barid genus for which the name *Eurhinus* Illiger is here requested. In this revision she uses *Eurhin* Illiger as the valid name, having been correctly advised to do so by several other specialists, including (at first) the author of the present application. It is known, however, (P. Vaurie, pers. comm.) that she would have preferred to use the name *Eurhinus* Illiger in anticipation of the success of this application.

REFERENCES

AGASSIZ, L. J. R. 1846. *Nomenclatoris zoologici index universalis.* Solothurn. viii+393 pp.

BERTHOLD, A. A. 1827. *Latreille's natürliche Familien des Thierreichs aus dem Französischen.* Weimar. x+604 pp.

BLACKWELDER, R. E. 1947. Checklist of the coleopterous insects of Mexico, Central America, the West Indies, the South America. *Bull. U.S. natn. Mus.* vol. 185, pp. i–iv, pp. 765–925.

BONDAR, G. 1948. Notas Entomológicas de Baia XX. *Revta Ent., Rio de J.* vol. 19, pp. 1–54.

CASEY, T. L. 1922. Studies in the Rhynchophorous subfamily Barinae of the Brazilian fauna. *Memoirs on the Coleoptera* X. Lancaster, Pennsylvania. 520 pp.

COSTA LIMA, A. da 1956. Coleópteros Part 4. *Insetos do Brasil,* vol. 10, Rio de Janeiro. 373 pp.

———1968. *Quarto catálogo dos insetos que vivem nas plantas do Brasil,* vol. 2(1), Rio de Janeiro, 622 pp.

CUVIER, G. L. C. F. D. 1829. *Le règne animal distribué d'après son organisation. Nouvelle édition,* vol. 5. Paris. xxiv+556 pp.
FITZINGER, L. J. F. J. 1843. *Systema reptilium. Amblyglossae.* Vienna. 106 pp.
FROGGATT, W. W. 1895. Life-histories of Australian Coleoptera. Part III. *Proc. Linn. Soc. N.S.W.,* vol. 10, pp. 325–336.
GEMMINGER, M. & HAROLD, E. VON 1871. *Catalogus Coleopterorum hucusque descriptorum synonymicus et systematicus,* vol. 8. Munich, pp. 2181–2668.
GERMAR, E. F. 1824. *Insectorum species,* vol. 1. *Coleoptera.* Halle. xxiv+624 pp.
GUERIN-MENEVILLE, F E. 1857. *Animaux articulés à pieds articulés. In* SAGRA, R. DE LA, *Histoire physique, politique et naturelle de l'île de Cuba.* Paris. lxxxvii+868 pp.
HUSTACHE, A. 1938. Curculionidae: Barinae. *Coleopt. Cat.,* part 163, 's–Gravenhage. 219 pp.
———1949. Nouveaux Barinae Sud-Américains. Première Partie. *Bolm. Mus. nac. Rio de J.* (Zoologia) No. 95, pp. 1–55.
[ILLIGER, J. C. W.] 1807. Nachlese zu den Bemerkungen, Berichtigungen und Zusätzen zu Fabricii *Systema Eleutheratorum. Magazin Insektenk. (Illiger),* vol. 6, pp. 296–317.
KIRBY, W. 1819 (dated 1818). A century of insects, including several new genera described from his cabinet. *Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond.,* vol. 12, pp. 375–453.
———& SPENCE, W. 1828. *An introduction to entomology.* Ed. 5, vol. 3, London. viii+732 pp.
KISSINGER, D. G. 1968. *Curculionidae, subfamily Apioninae of North and Central America with reviews of the world genera of Apioninae and world subgenera of Apion Herbst (Coleoptera).* South Lancaster, vii+559 pp.
LACORDAIRE, T. 1863. *Curculionides. Histoire naturelle des insectes. Genera des coléoptères,* vol. 6. Paris. iv+637 pp.
———1866. *Curculionides. Bruchides.* Ibid., vol. 7, iv+620 pp.
LATREILLE, P. A. 1825. *Familles naturelles du règne animal.* Paris. [vi]+570 pp.
LEA, A. M. 1909. Belinae d'Océanie. *In* LEA, A. M. & BOVIE, A., Coleoptera, fam. Curculionidae, subfam. Belinae. *Genera Insect.* Fasc. 91, pp 1–13.
MARSHALL, SIR GUY A. K. 1952. Taxonomic notes on Curculionidae (Col.). *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (12) vol. 5, pp. 261–270.
MEIGEN, J. W. 1830. *Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zweiflügeligen Insekten,* vol. 6, Hamm. xi+401 pp.
MORIMOTO, K. 1976. Notes on the family characters of Apionidae and Brentidae (Coleoptera), with key to the related families. *Kontyû,* vol. 44, pp. 469–476.
SCHÖNHERR, C. J. 1825 [Curculionides]. Continuatio tabulae synopticae familiae Curculionidum. *Isis,* Jena, vol. 9, cols. 581–588.
———1833. *Genera et species Curculionidum,* vol. 1, Paris. xv+681 pp.
———1836. *Ibid.* vol. 3. Paris and Leipzig. iv+858 pp.
WAGNER, H. 1910. Curculionidae: Apioninae. *Coleopt. Cat.* vol. 6, Berlin. 81 pp.

MYZUS FESTUCAE THEOBALD, 1917 (INSECTA, APHIDOIDEA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S)2389

By H. L. G. Stroyan (*Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries & Food, Harpenden Laboratory, Harpenden, Herts.*)

F. V. Theobald (1916, *Entomologist,* vol. 49, pp. 49–50) described a new aphid species *Macrosiphum myrmecophilum* from one adult and two immature specimens taken in an ant nest in Somerset. He also ascribed an earlier specimen from an ant nest in Ireland to this species, but it was too damaged to be used for the description.

2. The same author (1917, ibid., vol. 50, pp. 80–81) described a new aphid species *Myzus festucae* from *Festuca rubra* in Kent. A number of type and topotype slides remain in Theobald's collection now housed in the British Museum (Natural History).

3. The same author (1926, *The Plant Lice or Aphididae of Great Britain,* vol. 1, pp. 335–336 and 352–354) repeated his accounts of the above two species, both of which he now placed in the genus *Myzus* Passerini. He added some further locality records for *M. festucae* but not for *M. myrmecophilum.*

4. D. Hille Ris Lambers (1933, *Stylops,* vol. 2, p. 175) considered that both *Myzus festucae* and *M. myrmecophilum* were synonyms of *Metopolophium dirhodum* (Walker, 1848).

5. The same author later (1947, *Temminckia,* vol. 7, pp. 282, 287–290) maintained the synonymy of *myrmecophilum* with *dirhodum,* but now treated *festucae* as a distinct species of *Metopolophium* Mordvilko.

6. Since 1947 the name *Metopolophium festucae* (Theobald) has become well established in the literature both of aphid taxonomy and applied entomology, as the name of an aphid species causing damage to grass and cereal crops in Europe. A list of published references follows below:

(1) Hille Ris Lambers, D., 1947. *Temminckia,* vol. 7, pp. 287–290.
(2) Börner, C., 1952. *Mitt. thüring. bot. Ges., Beiheft* 3, 1. Lieferung, p. 157.
(3) Stroyan, H. L. G., 1952. *Pl. Pathol.,* vol. 1, pp. 46–47.
(4) Gair, R., 1953. *Ibid.,* vol. 2, p. 121.
(5) Edwards, C. A. & Heath, G. W., 1964. *The Principles of Agricultural Entomology,* pp. 182, 191, 194.
(6) Jones, F. G. W. & Jones, M. G., 1964. *Pests of Field Crops,* p. 317 (and 1974, 2nd edition, pp. 65, 68).
(7) Hille Ris Lambers, D., 1966. *Mitt. schweiz. entomol. Ges.,* vol. 39, p. 110.

(8) Müller, F. P., 1968. *Z. agnew. Entomol.*, vol. 61, pp. 131–141.
(9) Stroyan, H. L. G., 1969. *Trans. Soc. Brit. Entomol.*, vol. 18, p. 229.
(10) Eastop, V. F., 1971. *Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.)*, Entomology, vol. 26, pp. 19, 24, 77–78 (as *Acyrthosiphon (Metopolophium) festucae*).
(11) Hill, A. R., 1971. *Ann. appl. Biol.*, vol. 67, pp. 289–295.
(12) Dean, G. J. W., 1973. *J. appl. Ecol.*, vol. 10, pp. 447–462.
(13) Dean, G. J. W. & Wilding, N., 1973. *Ann. appl. Biol.* vol. 74, pp. 133–38.
(14) Plumb, R. T., 1974. *Ibid.*, vol. 77, pp. 87–91.
(15) Prior, R. N. B. & Morrison, J. R., 1974. *Key for the field identification of apterous and alate cereal aphids with photographic illustrations*, plate 4.
(16) Breniaux, D., Lescar, L. & Moreau, J. P., 1976. *Phytoma*, vol. 28, pp. 7–14.
(17) Eastop, V. F. & Hille Ris Lambers, D., 1976. *Survey of the World's Aphids*, p. 279.
(18) Prior, R. N. B., 1976. *Syst. Entomol.*, vol. 1, pp. 271–279.
(19) Stroyan, H. L. G., 1977. *Glasgow Nat.*, vol. 19, p. 245.

7. During the same period the name *myrmecophilum* Theobald has not been used as the valid name of an aphid taxon, except for a listing in reference (17) above unsupported by any details of its status; and no further material has been recorded from any locality since the original find in 1915.

8. Re-examination of the holotype of *Macrosiphum myrmecophilum* Theobald has led to the conclusion that it is the same species as *Myzus festucae* Theobald, which by the application of the Law of Priority becomes its junior subjective synonym. The evidence for this new synonymy is presented in a separate paper (Stroyan, H. L. G., Revisionary notes on the genus *Metopolophium* Mordvilko, 1914, with keys to European species and descriptions of two new taxa. *Zool. J. Linn. Soc. London*, vol. 75, pp. 91–140).

9. In view of the wide use in literature of the name *Metopolophium festucae* (Theobald) for an aphid of considerable importance as a crop pest, and of the failure of any author after Theobald to recognise *Macrosiphum myrmecophilum* Theobald, based on a unique adult specimen (the earlier damaged specimen has not type status and is apparently of a different species), as its senior synonym over a period of more than 60 years, I believe that the interests of stability in nomenclature would be best served by the conservation of the name *festucae* by exercise of the plenary powers.

10. Since both specific epithets are attributable to Theobald, no ethical question seems to arise from the preference of either name to the other.

11. I therefore ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the specific name *festucae* Theobald, 1917, as published in the binomen *Myzus festucae,* is to be given precedence over the specific name *myrmecophilum* Theobald, 1916, as published in the binomen *Macrosiphum myrmecophilum,* whenever the two names are held to be synonyms;

(2) to place the specific name *festucae* Theobald, 1917, as published in the binomen *Myzus festucae,* on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the specific name *myrmecophilum* Theobald, 1916, as published in the binomen *Macrosiphum myrmecophilum,* whenever the two names are held to be synonyms; and

(3) to place the specific name *myrmecophilum* Theobald, 1916, as published in the binomen *Macrosiphum myrmecophilum,* on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over the specific name *festucae* Theobald, 1917, as published in the binomen *Myzus festucae,* whenever the two names are held to be synonyms.

DACTYLOPUSIA NORMAN, 1903 (CRUSTACEA, COPEPODA): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES. Z.N.(S.)1517

By W. Vervoort and L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, Netherlands*)

In 1963 one of us (W.V.) applied to the Commission for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903 (Copepoda, THALESTRIDAE) (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 20, pp. 145–147). The species proposed as type species was *Dactylopusia vulgaris* G. O. Sars, 1905. Brinck, 1964 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 21, p. 193) proposed that *Dactylopus tisboides* Claus, 1863 should be the type species. The original proposals, when put to a vote of the Commission later in 1964, failed to receive a two-thirds majority vote. The history of the names involved is as follows.

2. *Dactylopus* Claus, 1863, *Die freilebenden Copepoden,* p. 126, was proposed for a large number of species without any fixation of the type species. The first species mentioned was *Cyclops stroemii* Baird, 1837, *Mag. Zool. Bot.*, vol. 1, p. 330.

3. Norman, 1903, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7), vol. 11, p. 368, recognised that *Dactylopus* Claus, 1863 was a junior homonym of *Dactylopus* Gill, 1860, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia* for 1859, p. 130, the name given to a genus of fishes. Norman thereupon proposed the new replacement name *Dactylopusia* for *Dactylopus* Claus *non* Gill and designated *Cyclops stroemii* Baird, 1837 as type species.

4. It is clear that Norman, when designating *Cyclops stroemii* as the type species of *Dactylopusia,* intended the thalestrid species identified by Claus as such. Unfortunately, the true *Cyclops stroemii* Baird, 1837 is a laophontid and is the type species, by original designation, of *Heterolaophonte* Lang, 1948, *Monographie der Harpacticiden,* p. 1364. If Norman's designation is accepted, therefore, *Dactylopusia* must be transferred from the THALESTRIDAE to the LAOPHONTIDAE where it will displace *Heterolaophonte.* This would gravely disturb the stability of nomenclature in the THALESTRIDAE, for *Dactylopusia* is a widely used name.

5. Lang, 1944, *Monographie der Harpacticiden,* Vorl. Mitteil., p. 12 'rebaptised' *Dactylopusia* as *Dactylopodia.* The latter name is an unjustified emendation and a junior objective synonym of *Dactylopusia.*

6. It is clear that Claus not only misidentified *Cyclops stroemii* Baird but included material of more than one species in it. Part of that material belongs to *Dactylopusia vulgaris* G. O. Sars, 1905, *Account of the Crustacea of Norway,* p. 128, and part to *Amonardia normani* (Brady, 1872), and further species may be represented. In the earlier application to the Commission it was suggested that *D. vulgaris* be designated as type species of *Dactylopusia.* However, Lang, 1944, p. 13, suggested that *D. tisboides* Claus, 1863, p. 127, should be taken as the

type species and we are happy to recommend this to the Commission. It appears that *D. vulgaris* Sars itself may be a composite species and this makes it less suitable as a type species of the genus. It is not our purpose, nor is it the business of the Commission, to examine the taxonomic problems affecting *C. stroemii* or *D. vulgaris.*

7. There are two subfamily names involved in the present case: DACTYLOPODIINAE Lang, 1936, *Further zool. results of the Swedish Antarctic Exped.*, vol. 3(3), pp. 22, 29; and DACTYLOPUSIINAE Vervoort, 1963, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 20, p. 146. DACTYLOPODIINAE was proposed by Lang for '*Dactylopusia, Dactylopusioides, Eudactylopsis, Diarthrodes,?Pelthestris*'; the generic name *Dactylopodia* was not proposed until 1944. DACTYLOPODIINAE is therefore best treated as an incorrect original spelling of DACTYLOPUSIINAE which, though first used by Vervoort in 1963, should be treated as the correct original spelling and attributed to Lang, 1936.

8. We therefore now ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all fixations of type species hitherto made for *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903 and to designate *Dactylopus tisboides* Claus, 1863 as type species of that genus;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Dactylopus tisboides* Claus, 1863;
   (b) *Heterolaophonte* Lang, 1948 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Cyclops stroemii* Baird, 1837;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *tisboides* Claus, 1863, as published in the binomen *Dactylopus tisboides* (specific name of type species of *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903);
   (b) *stroemii* Baird, 1837, as published in the binomen *Cyclops stroemii* (specific name of type species of *Heterolaophonte* Lang, 1948);

(4) to place the subfamily name DACTYLOPUSIINAE Lang, 1936 (corrected by Vervoort, 1963 from 'DACTYLOPODIINAE') (type genus *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology;

(5) to place the subfamily name DACTYLOPODIINAE Lang, 1936 (an incorrect original spelling of DACTYLOPUSIINAE) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

ANUROPODIDAE IN CRUSTACEA ISOPODA AND IN CRUSTACEA TANAIDACEA: PROPOSAL TO REMOVE THE HOMONYMY. Z.N.(S.)2429

By M. Bacescu (*Musée d'Histoire Naturelle 'Grigore Antipa', 1 Chaussée Kisselef, Bucuresti 79744, Romania*), J. Sieg (*Universität Osnabruck, Abt. Vechta (Biol.), 2848 Vechta, Fed. Rep. Germany*), & L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, Netherlands*).

Following the instructions laid down in Art. 55a of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is hereby asked to use its plenary powers to prevent a homonymy of family names, which is not a true homonymy (as the names of the respective type genera of these families are different, although rather similar in spelling), but is caused by the rules of grammar.

2. In 1886 Beddard (*Proc. zool. Soc. London*, 1886, p. 112) described a new genus of deep-sea Isopoda, *Anuropus*, type species, by monotypy, *Anuropus branchiatus* Beddard, 1886. Seven years later Stebbing (1893, *History of Crustacea*, p. 345) erected 'a distinct family, ANUROPIDAE' for Beddard's genus. The spelling ANUROPIDAE was later corrected to the grammatically correct ANUROPODIDAE, first by Calman (1907, Lankester's *Treatise on Zoology*, vol. 7, p. 210) who considered the taxon of only subfamily rank and consequently used the name ANUROPODINAE, and again by Sivertsen & Holthuis (1980, *Gunneria*, vol. 35, p. 28). However, notwithstanding the correction, the spelling ANUROPIDAE or ANUROPINAE was regularly used (e.g. by Nierstrasz, 1931, *Siboga Exped.*, Mon., 32 (c), p. 162; Hale, 1952 *Rep. B.A.N.Z. antarctic Res. Exped.*, (B)6(2), p. 29; Menzies & Dow, 1958, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.*, (13), vol. 1, p. 2). In the recently published (1982) vol. 1 of *The Biology of Crustacea* (ed. D. E. Bliss), Bowman & Abele in their chapter 'Classification of the Recent Crustacea' (p. 18) use the correct spelling ANUROPODIDAE. Only one other genus has been assigned to the family, viz., *Branchuropus* Moore, 1902. In all, six species have been described in the family, all of these rather rare and known only from very few records.

3. In 1980 Bacescu (*Trav. Mus. Hist. nat. Bucuresti*, vol. 22, p. 381) described a new genus of Tanaidacean Crustacea, *Anuropoda* (type species, by monotypy, *Anuropoda francispori* Bacescu, 1980). At the same time as describing the new genus and new species, Bacescu (1980, p. 384) erected for it the new family ANUROPODIDAE. This family name is also used by Bowman & Abele (1982, in Bliss, *Biology Crustacea*, vol. 1, p. 21), who noted the homonymy with ANUROPODIDAE Stebbing, 1893. Bacescu's family ANUROPODIDAE contains

a single species known only from the original record.

4. Although the name ANUROPODIDAE Stebbing is the older of the two family names, and even its emendation by Calman (1907) antedates the establishment of ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu by 75 years, it seems wisest to ask the Commission to change the spelling of the name of the older taxon. The incorrect spelling ANUROPIDAE has been used for the Isopod family more frequently than has the correct spelling and to ask for the legalisation of this incorrect spelling would not only end the state of homonymy, but also favour the usage of the more common spelling. The entire question of which name should be changed is of extremely little importance as both taxa are known almost exclusively to systematists.

5. The concrete proposal that we now submit, is the request that the Commission:

(1) make use of its plenary powers to rule that the stem of ANUROPUS Beddard, 1886, for the purposes of Article 29 is ANUROP–;

(2) place the following names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Anuropoda* Bacescu, 1980, (gender: feminine) type species, by monotypy, *Anuropoda francispori* Bacescu, 1980;
   (b) *Anuropus* Beddard, 1886, (gender: masculine) type species, by monotypy, *Anuropus branchiatus* Beddard, 1886;

(3) place the following names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *francispori* Bacescu, 1980, as published in the combination *Anuropoda francispori* (specific name of type species of *Anuropoda* Bacescu, 1980).
   (b) *branchiatus* Beddard, 1886, as published in the combination *Anuropus branchiatus* (specific name of type species of *Anuropus* Beddard, 1886).

(4) place the following names on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:
   (a) ANUROPIDAE Stebbing, 1893, type genus *Anuropus* Beddard, 1886, spelling legalised under the plenary powers under (1) above;
   (b) ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu, 1980, type genus *Anuropoda* Bacescu, 1980;

(5) place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family Names in Zoology the name ANUROPODINAE (correction by Calman, 1907 of ANUROPIDAE) Stebbing, 1893 as an incorrect spelling in consequence of the ruling given under the plenary powers in (1) above.

CALAPHIS WALSH, 1862, AND *CALLAPHIS* WALKER, 1870 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA, APHIDIDAE): PROPOSALS TO REMOVE THE CONFUSION. Z.N.(S.)2153

by F. W. Quednau (*Laurentian Forest Research Centre, P.O. Box 3800, Sainte–Foy, Quebec, G1V 4C7 Canada*)

The purpose of this application is to remove the confusion caused by the existence in the same aphid subfamily, DREPANOSIPHONINAE, of the available and nomenclaturally valid generic names, *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862, and *Callaphis* Walker, 1870. The facts are as follows:

2. Walsh, 1862 (*Proc. entomol. Soc. Philadelphia* vol. 1, p. 301) described the new genus *Calaphis* based monotypically on the new species *Calaphis betulella* Walsh, 1862. The main character of the genus is that the radial sector of the wing is lacking. Walker, 1870, (*The Zoologist,* vol. 5, p. 2000) apparently not knowing of Walsh's American work, established the new genus *Callaphis,* with *Aphis juglandis* Goeze, 1778, (*Ent. Beyträge* vol. 2, p. 311) as type species, by monotypy.

3. Buckton, 1881, (*Monogr. British Aphides,* vol. 3, p. 39) established the new genus *Ptychodes,* with type species *Aphis juglandis* Goeze, 1778, by monotypy. *Ptychodes* Buckton, besides being a junior objective synonym of *Callaphis* Walker, was already three times preoccupied, first by Audinet-Serville, 1835, for a coleopteran genus. Kirkaldy, 1904, (*Entomologist,* vol. 37, p. 279) proposed *Panaphis* as a new replacement name for *Ptychodes* Buckton, 1881. Palmer, 1952, Aphids of the Rocky Mountain Region, (*Thomas Say Foundation,* vol. 5, p. 79) accepted *Panaphis* and rejected *Callaphis* Walker in conformity with Opinion 147 (*Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.,* vol. 2, pp. 123–132). This provided, *inter alia,* that generic names of the same origin and meaning and differing only in the use of a single or a double consonant, should be considered homonyms. That ruling was repealed by the Paris (1948) Congress (*Bull. zool. Nom.,* vol. 4, p. 166); therefore the pre-existing provision that a difference of one letter prevents homonymy between generic names was restored. It appears as Article 56a in the present Code. *Panaphis* was thus rendered nomenclaturally invalid.

4. The confusion caused by the co-existence of *Calaphis* and *Callaphis* is increased because each name has been used as the basis of a tribe name (CALAPHIDINI, living mostly on trees of the birch family Betulaceae, CALLAPHIDINI, living mostly on trees of the beech family Fagaceae). To remove the cause of confusion, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Callaphis* Walker, 1870, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic names:

(a) *Panaphis* Kirkaldy, 1904 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Aphis juglandis* Goeze, 1778, and
(b) *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862, based monotypically on the new species *Calaphis betulella* Walsh, 1862, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific names:
(a) *juglandis* Goeze, 1778, as published in the binomen *Aphis juglandis* (specific name of type species of *Panaphis* Kirkaldy, 1904), and
(b) *betulella* Walsh, 1862 (specific name of type species of *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Callaphis* Walker, 1870, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;

(5) to place the family-group names CALAPHIDINI Oestlund, 1918, (*Rep. Minn. St. Entomol.*, vol. 18, p. 64) and PANAPHIDINI Oestlund, 1922, (*Rep. Minn. St. Entomol.*, vol. 22, p. 135) (type genera *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862, and *Panaphis* Kirkaldy, 1904, respectively) on the Official List of Family Group Names in Zoology;

(6) to place the family group name CALLAPHIDINAE Börner, 1952, (*Mitt. thüring. bot. Ver.* Beiheft 3, p. 32) (invalid because the name of its type genus has been suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family Group Names in Zoology.

UROPLAT—AS THE STEM OF FAMILY-GROUP NAMES IN AMPHIBIA AND INSECTA (COLEOPTERA): PROPOSALS TO REMOVE THE HOMONYMY. Z.N.(S.)2373.

By Hobart M. Smith (*Department of Environmental, Population and Organismic Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, 80309 U.S.A.*), Urless N. Lanham (*University of Colorado Museum*) and Arthur Loveridge (*deceased*).

A case of family-group name homonymy involving insects and reptiles has come to our attention. Since it pertains to large and/or well-known groups whose names are in current use, we request a decision on the proper names by the Commission, in conformance with the directive of Art. 55. We are much indebted to Dr Roger Conant and Dr Richard E. White for invaluable aid in documentation of the case.

2. The nominal genus *Uroplatus* Duméril, 1806, p. 80, containing six species of geckos in Madagascar, as now known, was emended erroneously to *Uroplates* Gray, 1825, p. 198, which served as the nominal type genus for the new generically monotypic family-group taxon UROPLATIDAE Boulenger, 1884, p. 119. That family-group name was widely accepted for about 50 years, but was synonymised with the GEKKONIDAE by Malcolm Smith, 1933, p. 17. The most recent revision of the higher categories of geckos (Kluge, 1967) did not recognise the genus as constituting any level of family-group separation, even tribal. Nevertheless the genus is highly distinctive and we regard it as valid at the subtribe level, hence Uroplatina (a level not treated by Kluge, *op. cit.*, or other monographers).

3. The nominal genus *Uroplata* Chevrolat in Dejean, 1835, p. 365, proposed for a group of 88 species of American (mostly South American) beetles as understood in 1970 (fide White, 1981, p. 714), served as the type genus for the family-group taxon UROPLATINI Leng, 1920, p. 303 (Coleoptera, CHRYSOMELIDAE, HISPINAE), proposed at the tribal level. Twenty-five New World genera were included in the tribe by Blackwelder, 1946, p. 729 and Arnett, 1960, p. 940. The genus *Uroplata* continues to be recognised as valid (e.g. Harley, 1969; White, 1981).

4. Thus two family-group names identical at common levels have been derived from similar although not identical generic names. A modification of the stem to remove family-group name homonymy without actually suppressing either name is in order. We suggest changing the lizard subtribal name to Uroplatiina, the stem of *Uroplatus* being designated as *Uroplati–*, to which appropriate family–group name endings should be added.

5. We accordingly here request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the stem of the generic

name *Uroplatus* Duméril, 1806 for the purposes of Article 29 is UROPLATI–

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Uroplatus* Duméril, 1806 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Stellio fimbriatus* Schneider, 1792, p. 32;
   (b) *Uroplata* Chevrolat, 1835 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by White, 1981, p. 714, *Hispa mucronata* Olivier, 1808, p. 765;

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *fimbriatus* Schneider, 1792, as published in the binomen *Stellio fimbriatus* (specific name of type species of *Uroplatus* Duméril, 1806);
   (b) *mucronata* Olivier, 1808, as published in the binomen *Hispa mucronata* (specific name of type species of *Uroplata* Chevrolat, 1835);

(4) to place the following names on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:
   (a) UROPLATIIDAE Boulenger, 1884 (emended through the ruling under the plenary powers in (1) above from UROPLATIDAE) (type genus *Uroplatus* Duméril, 1806);
   (b) UROPLATINI Leng, 1920 (type genus *Uroplata* Chevrolat, 1835).

REFERENCES

ARNETT, Ross H. 1960–62. *The beetles of the United States (a manual for identification)*. Washington, D.C., Catholic Univ. Amer. xi, 1112 pp.

BLACKWELDER, Richard E. 1946. Checklist of the coleopterous insects of Mexico. Central America, the West Indies and South America. Part 4. *Bull. U.S. Nat. Mus.*, no. 185, pp. i–iii, pp. 551–763.

BOULENGER, George A. 1884. Synopsis of the families of existing Lacertilia. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.*, (5) vol. 14, pp. 117–122.

DEJEAN, Pierre F. M. A. 1835. *Catalogue des coléoptères de la collection de M. le compte Dejean* . . . Ed. 2. Paris, Méguignon-Marvis.

DUMERIL, A. M. C. 1806. *Zoologie analytique, ou méthode naturelle de classification des animaux.* Paris, Perronneau, xxxii, 344 pp.

GRAY, J. E. 1825. A synopsis of the genera of reptiles and Amphibia, with a description of some new species. *Ann. Philos.* (n.s.) vol. 10, pp. 193–217.

HARLEY, K. L. S. 1969. The suitability of *Octotoma scabripennis* Guérin and *Uroplata girardi* Pic for the control of *Lantana* in Australia. *Bull. entomol. Res.*, vol. 54, pp. 835–843.

KLUGE, Arnold G. 1967. Higher taxonomic categories of gekkonid lizards and their evolution. *Bull. Am. Mus. nat. Hist.*, vol. 135 (1), pp. 1–60, figs. 1–8, pls. 1–5.

LENG, Charles W. 1920. *Catalogue of the Coleoptera of America, north of Mexico.* Mt. Vernon, N.Y., John D. Sherman, Jr. x, 470 pp.

OLIVIER, A. G. 1808. *Entomologie, ou histoire naturelle des insectes* ... Vol. 6, Coléoptères. Paris, pp. 613–1104.

SCHNEIDER, J. G. 1792. *Amphibiorum physiologiae specimen alterum.* Trajecti ad Viadrum. pp. 55.

SMITH, Malcolm A. 1933. Remarks on some Old World geckoes. *Rec. Indian Mus.*, vol. 35(1), pp. 9–19, figs. 1–7.

WHITE, Richard E. 1981. The genus *Uroplata*, type-species and authorship (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae). *Proc. entomol. Soc. Washington*, vol. 83(4), pp. 713–715.

OECIACUS VICARIUS HORVATH, 1912 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA, CIMICIDAE): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2358

By Richard C. Froeschner (*Department of Entomology, National Museum of Natural History, Washington, DC 20560*), Eugene V. Coan (*Department of Geology, California Academy of Sciences, Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, CA 94118*) & Raymond E. Ryckman (*Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, California 92350*)

James G. Cooper, 1870, pp. 105–106, in Spencer F. Baird, Ornithology, Vol. 1, Land Birds, reported a bed bug (CIMICIDAE), which he named *Cimex lunifrontis,* from the nests of the cliff swallow [then known as *Hirundo lunifrons* Say] in his house in Santa Cruz, California. He described the species thus: 'But these bugs were evidently a distinct species from the *Cimex lectularius,* being different, narrower, and pale yellowish, instead of the characteristic colour from which the name "Puce" is derived, through the French name of the insect. . . . As usual, their [the cliff swallow's] parasites are peculiar to them, and may be called *Cimex lunifrontis.'*

2. We have found no other use of the name *C. lunifrontis,* which is not even mentioned in R. L. Usinger's *Monograph of the Cimicidae,* 1966, Thomas Say Foundation, vol. 7. Specimens on which the above name was based were evidently not retained by Cooper.

3. The description, the Californian locality, and the cliff swallow host [now known under the combination *Pterochelidon pyrrhonota* (Vieillot)] allows no association other than with the 'swallow bug' later described by Horváth, 1912, *Ann. Mus. nat. Hist. Hung.,* vol. 10, p. 261 as *Oeciacus vicarius,* a combination that has been used regularly since that time to report these insects from cliff swallow nests, and occasionally to report them as wandering from empty swallow nests in houses and biting humans. *O. vicarius* has recently been shown to transmit an arbovirus of the cliff swallow — the first unequivocal case of its kind in medical entomology involving a Cimicid. This work will probably be frequently cited in the future particularly by workers experimenting with disease transmission by the two man-biting bed bugs (Rush, W. A., Francey, B., Smith, G. C. & Cropp, C. B., 1980, *Ann. entomol. Soc. America,* vol. 73(3), pp. 315–318, Transmission of an Arbovirus by a member of the family CIMICIDAE). Besides the twenty-two citations given in Usinger, 1966, pp. 365–366, many more could be added, such as: Van Duzee, 1917, *Univ. California Pubs. Entomol.,* vol. 2, p. 287; Torre–Bueno, 1921, *Bull. Brooklyn entomol. Soc.,* vol. 16, p. 29; Torre–Bueno, 1925, *Canadian Entomol.,* vol. 57, p. 30; List, 1925, *Proc. biol. Soc. Washington,* vol. 38, pp. 105, 108; Downes, 1927, *Proc.*

entomol. Soc. British Columbia, vol. 23, p. 11; Knowlton, 1952, *Bull. Brooklyn entomol. Soc.,* vol. 47, p. 122; Strickland, 1953, *Canadian Entomol.,* vol. 85, p. 199; Ryckman, 1958, *Ann. entomol. Soc. America,* vol. 51, p. 38; Lattin & Schuh, 1959, *Pan–Pacific Entomol.,* vol. 35, p. 176; Hicks, 1962, *Iowa State J. Sci.,* vol. 36, p. 261; Hicks, 1971, *Iowa State J. Sci.,* vol. 46, p. 169.

4. To avoid introducing a name that apparently has not been used in about 110 years and thus disturbing a substantial literature discussing this insect, we request the International Commission to:

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *lunifrontis* Cooper, 1870, as published in the binomen *Cimex lunifrontis,* for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not the law of Homonymy;

(2) place the specific name *vicarius* Horváth, 1912, as published in the binomen *Oeciacus vicarius* Horváth, 1912, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology; and

(3) place the specific name *lunifrontis* Cooper, 1870, as published in the binomen *Cimex lunifrontis,* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

	Page
Officers and Members of the Commission	i
Members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature	ii
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	1
Special Announcements	2
Financial Report for 1981	4
Commission Report : General Meeting, Ottawa, Canada, 23–27 August, 1982	7

Comments

Anolis Daudin, 1802 (Reptilia). C.W. Sabrosky; A.F. Stimson & G. Underwood	15
Attus otiosus Hentz, 1846 (Araneae, Salticidae). B. Cutler	19
Gorgonia flabelliformis Eichwald, 1840 (Graptolithina). Ph. Legrand; D. Skevington	19

Opinions

Opinion 1239. *Attelabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Coleoptera)	25
Opinion 1240. HESPERIIDAE Latreille, 1809 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)	27
Opinion 1241. CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898 and PALAEOTHENTIDAE Sinclair, 1906 (Mammalia)	29
Opinion 1242. *Cataphryxus* Shiino, 1936 (Crustacea, Isopoda)	33
Opinion 1243. *Erinaceus dauuricus* Sundevall, 1842 (Mammalia, Insectivora)	35
Opinion 1244. *Stethaspis Hope,* 1837 (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae)	37
Opinion 1245. *Linyphia tenebricola* Wider, 1834 (Arachnida)	39

New and revived cases

Pseudopontia Plötz *v. Gonophlebia* Felder (Insecta, Lepidoptera). C.F. Cowan	41
Family-groups based on *Myrmecia* (Insecta) and *Myrmecium* (Arachnida). J. Reiskind	43
Family group names based on *Eurhin, Eurhinus* and *Eurhynchus* (Coleoptera). E.C. Zimmerman; R.T. Thompson	45
Myzus festucae Theobald, 1917 (Insecta, Aphidoidea). H.L.G. Stroyan	53
Dactylopusia Norman, 1903 (Crustacea, Copepoda). W. Vervoort & L.B. Holthuis	56
ANUROPODIDAE in Crustacea Isopoda and in Crustacea Tanaidacea. M. Bacescu, J. Sieg & L.B. Holthuis	58
Calaphis Walsh, 1862 and *Callaphis* Walker, 1870 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Aphididae). F.W. Quednau	60
UROPLAT — as the stem of family-group names in Amphibia and Insecta (Coleoptera). H.M. Smith & U.N. Lanham	62
Oeciacus vicarius Horváth, 1912 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Cimicidae). R.C. Froeschner, E.V. Coan & R.E. Ryckman	65

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset

S 2102

15 July 1983 Volume 40 Part 2
pp. iii–iv, 67–128
ISSN 0007-5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD

Price £10.00 (All rights reserved).

NAT. HIST.
PURCHASED
ZOOLOGY LIBR

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. C.W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.).*

Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*

Secretary: Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**

Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 3, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**

Prof. E. BINDER *(Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, CH 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland)* (30 September 1972) **Mollusca**

Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**

Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**

Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**

Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**

Prof. H.E. WELCH *(Department of Zoology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3T 2N2 Canada)* (17 March 1976) **Nematoda**

Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**

Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(College Fellow in Life Sciences, School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(Councillor)* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**

Dr. Curtis W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (29 September 1976) *(President)* **Diptera**

Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia; E D P Methods**

Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**

Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN, *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**

Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**

Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**

Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**

Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN, *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**

Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**

Mr. David HEPPELL *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**

Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**

Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**

Dr. SHUNICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3–23–1. Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**

Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Sir Peter E. Kent, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon, F.R.I.C.
Prof. C.B. Cox
Prof. D. Curry, F.G.S.
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. C.W. Sabrosky *(ex officio)*
Sir Eric Smith, F.R.S.
Dr. C.A. Wright *(Observer)*

B. The Officer of the Trust

Mr. R. V. Melville, M.Sc. *(Scientific Controller)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 40, part 2 (pp. 67–128) 15 July 1983

NOTICES

(a) *Date of commencement of voting.* In normal circumstances the Commission may start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications in the present part is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretariat of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretariat before the close of the six-month period.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a-b and 79b):

(1) *Larentia capitata* Herrich–Schäffer, 1839 and *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2367. K. Mikkola.

(2) *Mya* Rondani, 1850 and *Somomya* Bertoloni, 1861 (Insecta, Diptera): designation of type-species and proposed suppression of *Somomya* under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2127. A.C. Pont.

(3) *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855: proposed change of type species in order to preserve the well-established name *Paralastor* Saussure, 1856 (Hymenoptera, Vespoidea, Eumenidae). Z.N.(S.) 2280. J. van der Vecht.

*(4) *Kassina* Girard, 1853 (Amphibia, Anura): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Eremiophilus* Fitzinger, 1843 under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2343. A. Dubois & J.–J. Morère and A.F. Stimson & B.T. Clarke.

(5) *Simia fascicularis* Raffles, 1821 (Mammalia, Primates): request for the suppression under the plenary powers of *Simia aygula* Linnaeus, 1758, a senior synonym. Z.N.(S.) 2399. P.H. Napier & C.P. Groves.

(6) *Allygus* Fieber, 1872 (Insecta, Homoptera): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 2431. F. Ossiannilsson.

*(7) *Mactra sachalinensis* Schrenk, 1862 (Mollusca, Bivalvia): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2332. A.I. Kafanov.

(8) CAECILIIDAE in Amphibia and Insecta (Psocoptera): proposals to remove the homonymy. Z.N.(S.) 2333. T.E. Moore, R.A. Nussbaum & E.L. Mockford.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since the publication of vol. 40/1 on 29 March 1983 (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b.):

(1) *Callionymus sagitta* Pallas, 1770 and *Callionymus filamentosus* Valenciennes, 1837 (Teleostei, Callionymidae): status of names and request to make an exception from article 75 C (4) & (5) for designating a neotype for *Callionymus sagitta* Pallas, 1770. Z.N.(S.) 2435. R. Fricke.

(2) *Crinodes* Herrich–Schäffer, 1855 and *Pero* 1856 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2436. D.S. Fletcher & I.W.B. Nye.

*(3) *Ciona* Fleming, 1822 and *Ascidia intestinalis* Linnaeus, 1767 (Ascidia, Urochordata, Cionidae): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2437. R. Bour & A. Dubois.

(4) *Cornalatus* Attenes, 1931 (Diplopoda, Polydesmida): proposed designation of type species under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2438. R.L. Hoffman.

(5) *Liasis* Gray, 1842 (Reptilia, Serpentes): proposed designation of a type species under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2439. A.F. Stimson & S.B. McDowell.

(6) LIPARIDAE: request for the proper spelling. Z.N.(S.) 2440. K.D. Vogt.

(7) *Semioptera wallacii* Gray, 1859 (Aves, Paradisaeidae): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2441. M. LeCroy.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

NEW MEMBERS OF THE TRUST

The following new members have been elected to the Trust:

The Rt Hon the Earl of Cranbrook (U.K.)
Dr G.C. Gruchy (Canada)
Dr M. Luc (France)
Dr I.W.B. Nye (U.K.)
Professor Per Brinck (Sweden)

Lord Cranbrook's membership is especially welcome because it will associate him, as President of the Appeal Patrons Committee, more directly with the general affairs of the Trust. Dr Nye was a member and Assistant Secretary of the Commission, 1976–1982. Professor Brinck is at present Vice-President of the Commission. Dr Gruchy, as Acting Director of the National Museum of Natural History, Ottawa, was particu-

larly helpful to the Commission during its meetings in that city in 1982 and is taking practical steps to sustain the work of the Commission.

OBITUARY

It is with great regret that we announce the death of Viscount Boyd of Merton, C.H., at the age of 78 following a street accident in London on 8 March last. Lord Boyd—the former Mr Alan Lennox Boyd—made a distinguished and varied contribution to British public and political life, and was a former Secretary of State for the Colonies in the British Government. He also gave his time generously to a wide range of social, charitable and scientific causes. From 1963 to 1976 he was a Trustee of the British Museum (Natural History) and we remember with particular gratitude the services he rendered to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, of which he was a valued member from 1967 to 1978.

At the time of his death Lord Boyd was a Patron of the Trust's internationally sponsored Appeal to fund the work of the International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

We acknowledge with grateful thanks the following donations to the Appeal Fund since the last list was published in volume 40 part 1, March 1983: Dr D.E. Butler; Academia Sinica Taiwan (further donation); Mr W.F.H. Ansell; the Royal Zoological Society of New South Wales; the Entomological Club; the Wellington Trust; the Danish National Science Research Council; the British Ornithologists' Union; the Royal Society of Western Australia; the MacRobert Trusts; Sir Charles Fleming, KBE, FRS (a further donation); the Australian Academy of Sciences (a further donation); the Palaeontological Association; the Naturvetenskapliga Forskningsrådet, Sweden; the Freshwater Biological Association (a further donation); and the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. Covenanted donations have been received from Dr A.J. Charig, Mrs P.B. Speak, Dr B.R. Rosen, Tricentrol Ltd and Professor V.C. Wynne Edwards. The gross value of the fund now stands at just over £50,000 (not counting expenditures).

It is especially gratifying to note the broadening international support for the Appeal.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
June 1983

COMMENT ON THE APPLICATION CONCERNING THE GENERIC NAMES *CHUANGIA* WALCOTT, 1911 AND *SHANTUNGIA* WALCOTT, 1905 Z.N.(S.)635

(see vol. 37, pp. 62–64)

By C. Lochman Balk (*Geology Department, Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro, Box 1241, New Mexico 87801*) and C. J. Stubblefield (*35 Kent Avenue, Ealing, W13 8BE*)

In the above application, paragraph 6, p. 63, we said that Walcott, 1913, *Publs Carnegie Inst.*, No. 54, Research in China, vol. 3, pp. II, V, 6, 7, 10, 53, 147, 148, 250, 255, 369, acted as a first reviser as between the two spellings *Shangtungia* and *Shantungia* Walcott, 1905. We are grateful to Dr C. W. Sabrosky for pointing out to us that that is not the case under the letter of the Code, since Walcott, 1913, did not cite both spellings and explicitly choose one and reject the other.

Since we know of no later author who has strictly complied with the requirements of the Code, we therefore now state explicitly that, as between those two spellings, we choose *Shantungia* as the correct original spelling and reject *Shangtungia* as the incorrect original spelling.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *APHYTIS MYTILASPIDIS* LE BARON, 1870. Z.N.(S.)2320

By A. D. Austin, B. Bolton, Z. Boucek, N. D. M. Ferguson, M. G. Fitton, I. D. Gauld, T. Huddleston, J. S. Noyes, J. Quinlan and B. R. Subba Rao (*British Museum (Natural History) and Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*)

(see vol. 39, pp. 73–76)

We are unanimously opposed to the suppression of *Agonioneurus albidus* Westwood, 1837, in favour of *Aphelinus mytilaspidis* Le Baron, 1870.

We are of the opinion that, although *mytilaspidis* Le Baron is a very well used name in the literature, use of the older valid name, *albidus* Westwood, would not cause undue confusion. We favour retention of *albidus* Westwood for the following reasons:

(1) The original type series of *albidus* Westwood, 1837, is still extant and the species is recognisable from the specimens of this series.

(2) The specific epithet, *albidus* Westwood, 1837, has to our knowledge not been linked with any other species of *Aphytis* and thus no confusion would result from its use as the valid name for *mytilaspidis* Le Baron, although it may result in a slight amount of inconvenience to workers in the field of biological control or ecology.

(3) The original type series of *mytilaspidis* Le Baron, 1870, is believed lost, but it is possible that it may be relocated. The possibility, however small, still exists that this material may represent a species distinct from *mytilaspidis* as now understood by Rosen & De Bach, 1979, and others.

If no genuine confusion will result, we are in principle against the retention of so-called 'better known' junior synonyms in favour of relatively less well known senior names. We are agreed that the use of the older name as valid in this particular and other similar cases may cause some initial inconvenience to field biologists, and they have our sympathies, but such inconvenience will certainly be short lived since the use of the older name will undoubtedly stabilise the nomenclature and the controversy will be forgotten in a very few years' time. It is possible that many unused names in insects, particularly in poorly worked groups such as Hymenoptera Parasitica, will later prove to be senior synonyms of relatively well known names. If this case, as proposed by Rosen & De Bach, is accepted, then it may lead to many more applications for suppression of older names in favour of those sentimentally favoured junior synonyms.

REFERENCE

ROSEN, D. & DE BACH, P. 1979. *Species of* Aphytis *of the world (Hymenoptera: Aphelinidae).* Israel Universities Press, Jerusalem, and Junk, The Hague, 801 pp., 1342 figs.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *KINOSTERNON ALAMOSE* AND *K. OAXACAE* PRITCHARD, 1979. Z.N.(S.)2339

(see vol. 39, pp. 212–213)

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

This application is supported by Professor Hobart M. Smith (*University of Colorado*), Dr James F. Berry (*Elmhurst College, Illinois*) and Dr John B. Iverson (*Earlham College, Indiana*). The purpose of the application is to ensure that the authorship of *Kinosternon alamosae* is attributed to Berry & Legler and that of *K. oaxacae* to Berry & Iverson.

COMMENTS ON RASNITSYN'S PROPOSAL TO REGULATE THE NAMES OF TAXA ABOVE THE FAMILY GROUP. Z.N.(S.)2381

By Denis J. Brothers (*Department of Entomology, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, 3200 South Africa*)

Rasnitsyn's (1982, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 200–207) formal proposal to change the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature so as to govern names above the family group level by extending the rules applicable at the lower levels, as proposed by Rohdendorf (1977, *Palaeont. Zhurnal.* vol. 11, pp. 14–22), needs thorough consideration. Although such proposals appear useful at first sight, there are various drawbacks. I do not intend to go into these in any detail here, but will merely indicate some of them. A more extensive discussion will be found in Brothers (1983, Nomenclature at the ordinal and higher levels, *Syst. Zool.* vol. 32, pp. 34–42).

Despite the statement in the proposal that 'the rule of the nomenclatural type . . . needs no comment,' this is the main problem. The use of type specimens at the species level is certainly indispensable. Type species at the generic level are also essential because of the requirements of binominal nomenclature. The use of type genera at the family group level is useful but can be confusing because the limits of a taxon designated by a particular name may change according to the opinions of the systematist. It is thus not obvious which group is meant when reference is made to 'VESPIDAE', for example—this may or may not include EUMENINAE, MASARINAE, etc.—unless the name is qualified by a statement such as '*sensu* Richards, 1962.' The problems which will result from application of a type concept at the higher levels are similar but will be much more extreme.

The reason for the confusion is that application of a type system confounds classification (subjective) and nomenclature. Ideally, nomenclature should be entirely objective such that a particular taxon (comprising particular subgroups) should always bear the same name and, furthermore, a particular name should not be applied to more than one taxon. Only under such conditions will it always be obvious exactly which group of organisms is involved when a particular name is used. Under the system proposed by Rasnitsyn and Rohdendorf a particular taxon will have different names depending on whether it is recognised at the ordinal or subordinal level, for example. Admittedly, the differences will be merely in the suffix, so that minimal confusion may result, but the names will still be different. On the other hand, the same name may very well be applied to different groups, depending on the opinions of the systematist as to whether a larger or a smaller grouping should be recognised at a particular categorical level. Thus, using a type system means that a particular group may have more than one name and also that a particular name may be applied to more than one group. I am thus convinced that the use of a type system at the higher levels will promote confusion rather than clarity and have suggested an alternative approach in my paper referred to above.

A further difficulty with Rasnitsyn and Rohdendorf's proposals, and one which should not be underestimated, is that their adoption will necessitate the abandonment of all names presently used for higher taxa and their replacement with names which will be very strange to many workers. This may not be an

extreme problem to the systematists actually working on each group, but it will drastically affect non-taxonomically oriented biologists. I thus anticipate that such rules are likely to be honoured more in the breach than the observance, as is already the tendency at the family group level. ('It involves too much time and effort to track down which author first used a name based on a generic name within the family group—systematists have more important things to do!' is a common argument). If rules are to be proposed then they must be such that most biologists will honour them. I suspect that any rules governing higher taxa, especially ones requiring extensive name changes, will not be so honoured, and it is for that reason that my proposals referred to above were put forward as principles and not as rules.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *GALEOPSOMYIA* GIRAULT, 1916. Z.N.(S.)2402
(see vol. 39, pp. 297–301)

(1) By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA, Leiden, Netherlands*)

(1) In their paragraph 3 the applicants state that Nowicki, 1929, designated *Trichaporus aleyrodis* Mercet, 1930, as the type species of *Trichaporus* Foerster, and *Trichoporus melleus* Ashmead, 1904, as type species of *Trichoporus* Ashmead, 1900. Furthermore, they state that this practice was generally accepted by workers since 1929. In their paragraph 5, however, they state *Trichaporus* Foerster sensu Nowicki is a senior synonym of a generally accepted name, *Encarsia* Foerster; and that *Trichoporus* Ashmead sensu Nowicki is a senior synonym of the widely used name *Galeopsomyia* Girault. The wide use of *Encarsia* and *Galeopsomyia* seems to be in contradiction to the general acceptance (after 1929) of their respective senior synonyms *Trichaporus* and *Trichoporus* sensu Nowicki. Can they explain this?

(2) If Ashmead, 1900, when using the spelling *Trichoporus* for the generic name *Trichaporus* Foerster, 1856, did not indicate expressly that he intentionally changed Foerster's spelling, *Trichoporus* is not an emendation but an erroneous subsequent spelling and consequently has no status. Therefore there is no reason to suppress it. The fact that he used *Trichoporus* several times in his paper does not show at all that it is intended as an emendation. He may have misread the word.

In 1949 Miss Buitendijk and I published a paper on a crab the name of which we cited as *Rhitropanopeus* Rathbun, 1898. We used that spelling consistently and frequently in the paper. Later it was pointed out to us that the correct spelling is *Rhithropanopeus*. I can emphatically state that our spelling was not an emendation but simply an error.

I believe that we should define 'emendation' very strictly. Either the author definitely states that he emends an older name, or he uses both spellings and makes it clear that he employs the new spelling to replace the old.

(2) Reply by J. LaSalle and P. DeBach

Dr Holthuis is right in assuming that workers have in general accepted the (incorrect and invalid) designations by Nowicki of *Trichaporus aleyrodis* Mercet, 1930 as type species of *Trichaporus* Foerster, 1856 and of *Trichoporus melleus* Ashmead, 1904 as type species of *Trichoporus* Ashmead, 1900. However, wide usage of the names *Encarsia* and *Galeopsomyia* is not inconsistent with those facts.

Since 1929 *Trichaporus* Foerster has been considered by some authors to be a valid generic name and by others to be a synonym of *Encarsia*. Those who have recognised it as a synonym of *Encarsia* (this synonymy is now generally accepted) have avoided the priority issue by placing *Trichaporus* as a junior synonym of *Encarsia* by citing the authorship as '(Foerster) Nowicki, 1929'. The fact that authors have resorted to this obviously illegitimate postdating of the authorship shows how important workers have felt the name *Encarsia* to be. The fact is that *Trichaporus* Foerster sensu Nowcki, while sometimes considered a synonym of *Encarsia*, has never been used as a senior synonym of *Encarsia*, even though that is what it clearly must be if *T. aleyrodis* were the correct type species.

Dr Holthuis's confusion regarding *Trichoporus* arises from the fact that *Trichoporus* Ashmead sensu Nowicki is not a synonym of *Galeopsomyia* as stated in his question. Nowicki designated *T. melleus* as type species of *Trichoporus*, and that has since been considered to make the name a junior synonym of *Exurus* Philippi, 1873 (a eulophid). It was not until many years after Nowicki that it was realised that these genera have anything to do with *Galeopsomyia*. We pointed out in 1981 that the correct type species for *Trichaporus* Foerster is *Euderus columbianus* Ashmead, 1888, and that this same species was chosen by Girault, 1916, as the type species of *Galeopsomyia* as well. If *Trichoporus* is treated as an emendation of *Trichaporus* (as in our application), it is a junior objective synonym of the latter and takes the same type species, and then it becomes an objective synonym of *Galeopsomyia*. If it is an erroneous subsequent spelling (as Dr Holthuis claims), it has no existence in nomenclature.

The contradiction mentioned by Dr Holthuis therefore does not exist, because even though Nowicki's invalidly designated type species were generally accepted, *Trichaporus* (in anybody's sense of the name) was never used as a senior synonym of *Encarsia* and *Trichoporus* Ashmead sensu Nowicki was never used as a synonym of *Galeopsomyia*. In fact neither of these names (sensu Nowicki) was ever used as a senior synonym of any other name.

On Dr Holthuis's second point, since our purpose is to get rid of *Trichoporus*, we are happy to accept his view that the name is an erroneous subsequent spelling without status in nomenclature. Points (1) and (4) of our detailed proposals should be modified accordingly. Mention of *Trichoporus* should be deleted in (1) and (4) should read: 'place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology: (a) *Trichaporus* Foerster, 1856, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above; (b) *Trichoporus* Ashmead, 1900, an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Trichaporus*.'

OPINION 1246

HERPETODRYAS MARGARITIFERUS SCHLEGEL, 1837 (REPTILIA, SERPENTES): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *chiametla* Shaw, 1802, as published in the binomen *Coluber chiametla,* is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *margaritiferus* Schlegel, 1837, as published in the binomen *Herpetodryas margaritiferus,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2850.

(3) The specific name *chiametla* Shaw, 1802, as published in the binomen *Coluber chiametla,* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1116.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1704

An application for the suppression of *Coluber chiametla* Shaw, 1802 was first received from Professor Hobart M. Smith (then of *University of Illinois*) on 30 March 1965. It was sent to the printer on 20 May 1965 and published on 2 November 1965 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 22, pp. 235–236. An adverse comment from the late Dr James A. Peters (*U.S. National Museum*) was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 24, p. 138, 1967. In consequence a revised application by Professor Smith and Mrs Rozella B. Smith (*University of Colorado*) in which evidence was given of extensive usage of the junior synonym involved (*Herpetodryas margaritiferus* Schlegel, 1837) as against only four uses of *Coluber chiametla* since its first proposal, was sent to the printer on 18 July 1978 and published on 19 February 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 184–186. The application was supported by a working committee of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists. No adverse comment was received.

Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general and two herpetological serials.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (1982)17 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 185. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Uéno, Willink, Sabrosky, Schuster, Corliss, Halvorsen, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Cogger, Ride

Negative Votes — two (2): Savage, Dupuis.

Bernardi was on leave of absence. Welch returned a late affirmative vote. No voting papers were returned by Binder and Lehtinen.

Professor Savage observed: 'The basis for this proposal is to preserve the applicant's specific name *fistulosus* H. M. Smith, 1942. If the application is denied the name *margaritiferus* Schlegel, 1837, would still be in use in the combination *Drymobius chiametla margaritiferus*. These name changes will have no effect outside systematic herpetology.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

chiametla, Coluber, Shaw, 1802, *General Zoology* (Amphibia), vol. 3 (2), p. 440

margaritifera, Herpetodryàs, Schlegel, 1837, *Essai phys. Serp.*, vol. 1, p. 151, vol. 2, p. 184.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)17 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1246.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
15 March 1983

OPINION 1247
DACTYLOPIUS COSTA, (NOV. 1829) AND *PSEUDOCOCCUS* WESTWOOD, 1840 (INSECTA, HOMOPTERA): DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) The generic name *Diaprosteci* Costa, 1828 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(b) the date of publication of Costa's *Fauna del regno di Napoli, Famiglia de' cocciniglíferi o de' gallinsetti, Emitteri* (Napoli) is hereby ruled to be (Nov. 1829);

(c) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genera *Dactylopius* Costa, (Nov. 1829) and *Pseudococcus* Westwood, 1840 are hereby set aside and the following designations are here made:

(i) for *Dactylopius* Costa, (Nov. 1829), *Dactylopius coccus* Costa, (Nov. 1829);

(ii) for *Pseudococcus* Westwood, 1840, *Dactylopius longispinus* Targioni-Tozzetti, 1867;

(d) the following specific names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

(i) *adonidum* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Coccus adonidum*;

(ii) *coffeae* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Pediculus coffeae.*

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Dactylopius* Costa, (Nov. 1829) (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in 1c(i) above, *Dactylopius coccus* Costa, (Nov. 1829) (Name Number 2187);

(b) *Pseudococcus* Westwood, 1840 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in 1(c)(ii) above, *Dactylopius longispinus* Targioni-Tozzetti, 1867 (Name Number 2188).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *coccus* Costa, (Nov. 1829), as published in the binomen *Dactylopius coccus* (specific name of type species of *Dactylopius* Costa, (Nov. 1829) (Name Number 2851);

(b) *longispinus* Targioni-Tozzetti, 1867, as published in the binomen *Dactylopius longispinus* (specific name of type

species of *Pseudococcus* Westwood, 1840) with an endorsement that it is to be interpreted by reference to the neotype designated by Miller, 1981, *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 38, p. 83 (Name Number 2852).

(4) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) DACTYLOPIIDAE (Correction of 'Dactylopites') Signoret, 1875 (type genus *Dactylopius* Costa, (Nov. 1829)) (Name Number 554);

(b) PSEUDOCOCCIDAE Cockerell, 1905 (type genus *Pseudococcus* Westwood, 1840) (Name Number 555).

(5) The title of the following publication, *Fauna del Regno di Napoli, Famiglia de' cocciniglíferi o de' gallinsetti, Emitteri* by O. G. Costa is hereby placed on the Official List of Works Approved as Available in Zoological Nomenclature, with an endorsement that its date of publication is to be cited as (Nov. 1829) and with the Title Number 46.

(6) The generic name *Diaprosteci* Costa, 1828, as suppressed under the plenary powers in 1(a) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2133.

(7) The following specific names, as suppressed under the plenary powers in 1(d)(i and ii) above, are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *adonidum* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Coccus adonidum* (Name Number 1117);

(b) *coffeae* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Pediculus coffeae* (Name Number 1118).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2091

A proposal to designate type species for the genera *Dactylopius* Costa and *Pseudococcus* Westwood under the plenary powers was first received from Dr Douglass R. Miller (then of *Systematic Entomology Lab, USDA, Beltsville, Maryland 20705, U.S.A.*) on 9 October 1973. It was sent to the printer on 5 April 1974 and published on 20 September 1974 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31, pp. 146–153. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to eight entomological serials.

Dr Miller had asked that the date of publication of the work by O. G. Costa involved in the application should be ruled to be '[1835]', but Dr L. B. Holthuis wrote to draw attention to a work by d'Erasmo, 1949, *Rendiconti Accad. Sci. fis. mat. Soc. Naz. Sci. Lett. Arti Napoli* (4), vol. 16, pp. 14–36, giving evidence that the date of publication

should be cited as '(Nov. 1829)'. Dr Holthuis's letter was circulated to the members of the Commission with the voting papers on the case and his evidence has been taken into account in drafting the present Ruling. [In considering the application of Recommendation 22A to the citation of this date, I have treated Costa's *Fauna del Regno di Napoli* as a single work and have therefore enclosed the date in parentheses, not in square brackets. R.V.M.]

In February 1976 an extensive comment on the case was received from Dr Evelyna Danzig and Dr I. M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad, USSR*) and copied to Dr Miller for his observations. Both were published on 30 April 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 79–83. The application was also supported by Dr Helen M. Brookes (*Waite Agricultural Research Institute, University of Adelaide, South Australia*). No adverse comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)19 on the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31, pp. 150–151 and emended in vol. 38, pp. 81–83. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Uéno, Mroczkowski, Willink, Sabrosky, Halvorsen, Schuster, Corliss, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Ride

Negative Votes — none (0).

Bernardi was on leave of absence. Cocks and Dupuis abstained. A late affirmative vote was returned by Welch. No voting papers were returned by Binder, Cogger and Lehtinen.

Dupuis commented: 'Il n'est possible de voter le cas 2091 ni sous la forme originale, ni avec les additions de Danzig & Kerzhner, ni avec celles de Miller, ni compte tenu de la correction (justifiée) sur la date de 1829 pour Costa. En effet: (1) La Commission ne peut pas endosser sans examen sérieux l'idée que *"Diaprosteci"* soit un nom de genre. Il me paraît s'agir d'une division collective car ce nom est au pluriel, le pluriel de Diaprostecus. Ce nom vient du grec "diapro-steichos", de diapro = d'un bout à l'autre, et stichos, steicho, de stits = rang, ligne. Il signifie "ligné de bout en bout" (peut-être les "longitudinal rows" de Danzig & Kerzhner, p. 80, d'où possibilité d'identification dès Costa, 1829). (2) Westwood, 1840, Synopsis p. 1, en note, a déclaré que sous chaque genre il a mentionné la "typical species" et l'Opinion 71 considère cette désignation comme valide. La discussion de Miller à ce sujet est incomplète et le suivre sans examen serait courir un risque de contradiction avec l'Opinion 71. J'ajoute que la "course au néotype" entre divers Musées m'a paru une bonne plaisanterie.'

[The following observations may be made on these comments. Mr George Steyskal also takes the name to be in the plural but derives it from the Greek 'prosteko', to stick fast to something, which would be very suitable for a scale insect. I had discussed with Dr Miller the possibility of asking that this name be ruled as unavailable, but in the end it seemed better to ask for suppression, in case the name has been used as an available name. As Dr Miller showed, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31, p. 148, Westwood in his Synopsis cited *Pseudococcus* with two included species. Not even Opinion 71 can rule that two species are the type species. I have verified this reference. R.V.M.]

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

adonidum, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 12, vol. 1(2), p. 740

coccus, Dactylopius, Costa, O. G., (Nov. 1829), *Fauna del Regno di Napoli,* Coccinigliferi, p. 16

coffeae, Pediculus, Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 12, vol. 1(2), p. 740

DACTYLOPIIDAE Signoret, 1875, *Ann. Soc. entomol. France,* (5) vol. 5, p. 305

Dactylopius Costa, (Nov. 1829), *Fauna del Regno di Napoli,* Coccinigliferi, pp. 2, 15

Diaprosteci Costa, O. G., 1828, *Pontano,* vol. 1, p. 453

longispinus, Dactylopius, Targioni-Tozzetti, 1867, *Mem. Soc. ital. Sci. nat.,* vol. 3, p. 75

PSEUDOCOCCIDAE Cockerell, 1905, *Univ. Colorado Studies,* vol. 2, p. 193

Pseudococcus Westwood, 1840, *Introduction to modern classification of insects,* vol. 2, pp. 447, 488.

The following is the title of a work placed on the Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature: Costa, O. G., (Nov. 1829), *Fauna del Regno di Napoli,* famiglia de' coccinigliferi o de' gallinsetti, Emitteri. Napoli.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)19 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1247.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
17 March 1983

OPINION 1248

LETHOCERUS MAYR, 1853 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Iliastus* Gistel, [1848] is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Lethocerus* Mayr, 1853 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Lethocerus cordofanus* Mayr, 1853, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2189.

(3) The specific name *fakir* Gistel, [1848], as published in the binomen *Belostoma fakir* (the valid name at the time of this ruling for the type species of *Lethocerus* Mayr, 1853) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2853.

(4) The generic name *Iliastus* Gistel, [1848], as suppressed under the plenary powers in 1 above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2134.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2161

An application for the conservation of *Lethocerus* Mayr, 1853 was first received from Dr Arnold Menke (*Systematic Entomology Lab USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*) on 20 January 1976. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 26 September 1978 and published on 31 May 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 236–238. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general serials and seven entomological serials. Dr Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad, USSR*) wrote to point out, first, that the date of publication of Gistel's *Naturgeschichte des Thierreiches* is 1848, and secondly that *Lethocerus cordofanus* Mayr, 1853 is a junior synonym of *Belostoma fakir* Gistel, [1848], and that this latter name should be placed on the Official List as the valid name for the species. In all other respects he supported Dr Menke's application (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 5–6). Dr Menke accepted Dr Kerzhner's point. No other comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)20 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 237,

as modified in vol. 37, p. 6. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Uéno, Mroczkowski, Willink, Sabrosky, Corliss, Halvorsen, Schuster, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Cogger, Heppell, Welch, Ride. Dupuis voted partially in favour (for suppression of *Iliastus*).

Negative Vote — Hahn.

Bernardi was on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Binder and Lehtinen.

Hahn commented: 'As expressed in the application, *Iliastus* and *Lethocerus* have different type species (*Nepa grandis* for *Iliastus* and *Lethocerus cordofanus* for *Lethocerus*). Therefore the two generic names are subjective synonyms and only the "relative precedence" procedure should be used to suppress *Iliastus*. I do not agree to suppress *Iliastus* completely, as proposed by Dr Menke.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

fakir, Belostoma, Gistel, [1848], *Naturgeschichte des Thierreiches,* p. 191

Iliastus Gistel, [1848], *Naturgeschichte des Thierreiches,* p. 149

Lethocerus Mayr, 1853, *Verh. zool.-bot. Ver. Wien,* vol. 2, Sitzungsber., p. 17.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)20 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1248.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
22 March 1983

OPINION 1249

TOXOSTOMA CRISSALE RULED TO BE THE CORRECT ORIGINAL SPELLING OF THE NAME FIRST PUBLISHED AS *TOXOSTOMA DORSALIS* BAIRD, 1858 (AVES)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that *crissale* is the correct original spelling of the name first published in May, 1858 as *dorsale* by Baird, 1858, in the combination *Toxostoma dorsalis.*

(2) The specific name *crissale* Baird, May 1858, as published in the combination *Toxostoma crissalis* (*sic*), and as ruled in (1) above to be a correct original spelling, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2854.

(3) The specific name *dorsalis* Baird, May 1858, as published in the combination *Toxostoma dorsalis,* and as an incorrect original spelling through the ruling given in (1) above, of *Toxostoma crissale* Baird, May 1858, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1119.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2215

An application from Dr John P. Hubbard (*Santa Fe, New Mexico, U.S.A.*) for the validation of *Toxostoma crissale* over *T. dorsalis* was first received on 11 February 1977. Dr Hubbard also asked for an addition to Article 32 of the Code to deal with unintended original spellings. The double application was sent to the printer on 6 October 1978 and published on 31 May 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 239–242. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to eight general and nine ornithological serials. The application was supported by the late Dr E. Eisenmann as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress on behalf also of a majority of its members; and as Chairman of the American Ornithologists' Union Committee on Classification and Nomenclature on behalf also of all its members (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 4). The application was also supported by Dr A. R. Phillips (*Denver Museum of Natural History, Colorado, U.S.A.*). No adverse comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)21 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 242.

The voting paper reported the decision of the Editorial Committee on the Code not to accept the proposed addition to Article 32. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting on the particular nomenclatural issue was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Uéno, Mroczkowski, Willink, Sabrosky, Schuster, Corliss, Halvorsen, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Ride. (Dr Uéno wished his vote to be recorded with the majority).

Negative Votes — none (0).

Bernardi was on leave of absence. Welch returned a late affirmative vote. No votes were returned by Binder, Cogger and Lehtinen.

Dupuis commented: 'Il est excellent que le bon sens — en l'espèce les intentions du taxinomiste—prévale sur le formalisme étroit des "Règles". Personnellement j'inclinerais aussi à la modification proposée de l'Article 32'.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

crissalis (*sic*) *Toxostoma,* Baird, June 1858, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia* vol. 10, pp. 117–118 (corrected pages)

dorsalis (sic), *Toxostoma,* Baird, May 1858, in Henry, T. C., *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia,* vol. 10, pp. 117–118.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast in V.P.(82)21 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1249.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
24 March 1983

OPINION 1250

GYROHYPNUS SAMOUELLE, 1819, EX LEACH MS, *XANTHOLINUS* DEJEAN, 1821, EX DAHL, AND *OTHIUS* STEPHENS, 1829, EX LEACH MS (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED FOR THESE GENERA

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species hitherto made for the three nominal genera named below are hereby set aside, and

(a) *Staphylinus fracticornis* O. F. Müller, 1776 is hereby designated as the type species of *Gyrohypnus* Samouelle, 1819, ex Leach MS;

(b) *Staphylinus linearis* Olivier, 1794 is hereby designated as the type species of *Xantholinus* Dejean, 1821, ex Dahl;

(c) *Staphylinus punctulatus* Goeze, 1777 is hereby designated as the type species of *Othius* Stephens, 1829, ex Leach MS.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Gyrohypnus* Samouelle, 1819, ex Leach MS (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above, *Staphylinus fracticornis* O. F. Müller, 1776 (Name Number 2190);

(b) *Xantholinus* Dejean, 1821, ex Dahl (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Staphylinus linearis* Olivier, 1794 (Name Number 2191);

(c) *Othius* Stephens, 1829, ex Leach MS (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(c) above, *Staphylinus punctulatus* Goeze, 1777 (Name Number 2192);

(d) *Gauropterus* C. G. Thomson, 1869 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Staphylinus fulgidus* Fabricius, 1787 (Name Number 2193).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *fracticornis* O. F. Müller, 1776, as published in the binomen *Staphylinus fracticornis* (specific name of type species of *Gyrohypnus* Samouelle, 1819, ex Leach MS) (Name Number 2855);

(b) *linearis* Olivier, 1794, as published in the binomen *Staphylinus linearis* (specific name of type species of *Xantholinus* Dejean, 1821, ex Dahl) (Name Number 2856);

(c) *punctulatus* Goeze, 1777, as published in the binomen *Staphylinus punctulatus* (specific name of type species of *Othius* Stephens, 1829, ex Leach MS) (Name Number 2857);
(d) *fulgidus* Fabricius, 1787, as published in the binomen *Staphylinus fulgidus* (specific name of type species of *Gauropterus* C. G. Thomson, 1860) (Name Number 2858).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2221

An application by Dr A. Smetana (*Biosystematics Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada*) for the resolution of problems arising from the designation of *'Staphylinus fulgidus'* as the type species of several nominal genera was first received on 22 April 1977. After some correspondence it was sent to the printer on 16 February 1979 and published on 1 July 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 44–52. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general serials and seven entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (1982)22 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 50–51. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983, the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Uéno, Willink, Sabrosky, Schuster, Corliss, Halvorsen, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Ride

Negative Votes — Holthuis, Savage.

Bernardi was on leave of absence. Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Dupuis abstained from voting. No votes were returned by Binder, Cogger and Lehtinen.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'It seems to me that Blackwelder 30 years ago straightened out the nomenclature of these genera and evidently he is followed by North American authors. His 1952 revision of the generic names is a standard work by an accomplished coleopterist and nomenclaturist. Dr Smetana did not indicate the nomenclaturally correct names for the genera he cited as *Xantholinus, Othius* and *Gauropterus* nor did he give evidence of their usage. It is most aggravating that no comments were received from any coleopterist.' [A letter from Dr Smetana giving evidence of recent usage was circulated to the members of the Commission on 4 January 1983. R.V.M.]

Savage: 'The reasoning of Blackwelder, 1952, is correct and follows automatically from the Code. Just as much confusion results from the proposal.'

Dupuis: 'Je m'abstiens pour trois raisons: (1) la complication du cas; (2) mes scrupules à remettre en cause la qualité formelle du travail de Blackwelder, 1952; (3) l'inexplicable absence de commentaires de la part des spécialistes, alors que les coleoptéristes sont les plus nombreux parmi les taxinomistes. S'ils se désinteressent de la question, nous perdons notre temps à prendre des décisions qu'ils ne liront même pas.'

[In 1952 Dr Blackwelder should in fact have guided himself by the decision of the Paris (1948) Congress (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 4, pp. 158–159) that cases of genera based on misidentified type species should be referred to the Commission. Although that decision was not incorporated into the Code until 1961, zoologists were recommended (*ibid.*, p. 342) to guide themselves by those decision pending their incorporation into a revised Code. R.V.M.]

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

fracticornis, Staphylinus, O. F. Müller, 1776, *Zool. Dan. Prodr.*, p. 99

fulgidus, Staphylinus, Fabricius, 1787, *Mantissa Ins.*, p. 220

Gauropterus C. G. Thomson, 1860, *Skand. Coleopt.*, vol. 2, p. 187

Gyrohypnus Samouelle, 1819, ex Kirby MS, *Entomol. useful compendium,* p. 172

linearis, Staphylinus, Olivier, 1794, *Entomologie, hist. nat. Ins.*, vol. 3, No. 42, p. 19, pl. 4, fig. 38

Othius Stephens, 1829, ex Leach MS, *Nomenclature British insects,* p. 23

punctulatus, Staphylinus, Goeze, 1777, *Entomol. Beiträge Linne 12. Ausgabe Natursystems,* vol. 1, p. 730

Xantholinus Dejean, 1821, ex Dahl, *Cat. coll. coleopt. Dejean,* p. 23.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)22 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1250.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
30 March 1983

OPINION 1251

DICRANODONTA WOODS, 1899 (BIVALVIA, CUCULLAEIDAE): DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal subgenus *Dicranodonta* Woods, 1899 are hereby set aside and *Cucullaea benniworthensis* Kelly, 1978 is hereby designated as type species of that subgenus.

(2) The subgeneric name *Dicranodonta* Woods, 1899 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Cucullaea benniworthensis* Kelly, 1978, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2194.

(3) The specific name *benniworthensis* Kelly, 1978, as published in the binomen *Cucullaea benniworthensis* (specific name of type species of *Dicranodonta* Woods, 1899) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2859.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2227

An application from Dr S. R. A. Kelly (then of *Goldsmiths College, London*) for the designation of a type species for *Dicranodonta* Woods, 1899 was first received on 15 July 1977. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 16 February 1978 and published on 31 October 1978 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 127–128. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general serials, three malacological and two palaeontological serials.

The application was supported by Mr A. A. Morter (*Institute of Geological Sciences, London*). Dr Colin Forbes (*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge*) wrote to point out that the registered number of the specimen cited by Dr Kelly as the holotype of *C. benniworthensis* (the original of Woods, 1899, pl. 10, fig. 14) was Sedgwick Museum No. 5. 11221, not B. 11222, as cited by Dr Kelly. Dr Kelly replied (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 201) that he had indeed associated the wrong number and illustration but that he had intended the original of Woods, pl. 10, fig. 11a–c—B.11222—as the holotype. This was referred to in the voting paper. There were no other comments.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)24, for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 128,

as corrected in vol. 36, p. 201. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Uéno, Mroczkowski, Willink, Corliss, Halvorsen, Schuster, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Cogger, Ride

Negative Votes—Savage.

Sabrosky abstained. Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Binder and Lehtinen.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Sabrosky: 'I sympathise with the desire to clarify the type species of *Dicranodonta* under Article 70, but I cannot approve this loose proposal of *Cucullaea benniworthensis*. Where is the "statement that purports to give characters differentiating the [specific] taxon" (Article 13a(i))?'

Savage: 'Without some indication of usage it is hard to see why this subgeneric name needs to be preserved. Why not let the original designation of *donningtonensis* stand? It seems to me that in cases involving Article 70a the applicant needs to show the Commission how stability will best be served. In this case we have no data regarding the effect of following alternatives (i) or (iii).'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

benniworthensis, Cucullaea, Kelly, 1978, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 128, vol. 36, p. 201

Dicranodonta Woods, 1899, Cretaceous Lamellibranchia, vol. 1, p. 53, *Palaeontogr. Soc. London.*

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)24 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1251.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
7 April 1983

OPINION 1252

STERNA CERULEA BENNETT, 1840 (AVES): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *australis* Gmelin, 1789, as published in the binomen *Sterna australis*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *cerulea* Bennett, 1840, as published in the binomen *Sterna cerulea*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2860.

(3) The specific name *australis* Gmelin, 1789, as published in the binomen *Sterna australis*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1120.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2233

An application for the conservation of *Sterna cerulea* Bennett, 1840, was first received on 29 September 1977 from Mr D. T. Holyoak (*Department of Geography, University of Reading, U.K.*) on behalf of himself, Dr Murray D. Bruce (*Turramurra, N.S.W., Australia*) and Monsieur J.-C. Thibault (*13 rue Daubenton, 75005 Paris, France*). It was sent to the printer on 16 February 1978 and published on 1 February 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 187–188. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general serials and nine ornithological serials. The application was supported by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress (Dr Eugene Eisenmann, Chairman).

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)25 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 188. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983, the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Uéno, Mroczkowski, Willink, Sabrosky, Corliss, Halvorsen, Schuster, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Cogger, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes—none (0).

Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Binder and Lehtinen.

Dupuis enquired: 'What happens "if the Grey Noddy were found to consist of several sibling species" (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 188)?' [In that event, the Law of Priority would apply to the names involved, of which *Sterna cerulea* Bennett, 1840 is now presumably the senior. R.V.M.]

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

australis, Sterna, Gmelin, 1789, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 13, vol. 1(2), p. 608

cerulea, Sterna, Bennett, 1840, *Narrative Whaling Voyage,* vol. 2, p. 248.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)25 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1252.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
7 April 1983

OPINION 1253

CHROMODORIS CALIFORNIENSIS BERGH, 10 MAY 1879 (MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA): CONSERVED

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers, the specific name *glauca* Bergh, 31 March 1879, as published in the binomen *Chromodoris glauca,* is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *californiensis* Bergh, 10 May 1879, as published in the binomen *Chromodoris californiensis,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2861.

(3) The specific name *glauca* Bergh, 31 March, 1879, as published in the binomen *Chromodoris glauca,* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1121.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2253

An application for the conservation of *Chromodoris californiensis* Bergh, 10 May 1879 was first received from Dr Hans Bertsch (*Chaminade University of Honolulu, Hawaii*) and Dr Robert Burn (*National Museum of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia*) on 1 March 1978. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 4 August 1978 and published on 31 May 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 253–256. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general serials and three malacological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)27 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 255. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Uéno, Willink, Corliss, Sabrosky, Halvorsen, Schuster, Kraus, Brinck, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Savage, Hahn, Dupuis, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Cogger, Ride

Negative Votes—none (0).

Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Binder and Lehtinen.

Kraus remarked: 'It is only for the sake of stability of usage in major faunistic textbooks (especially Keen, 1971) that I vote—with hesitation—in favour of the application.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

californiensis, Chromodoris, Bergh, 10 May 1879, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia,* vol. 31, pp. 112–114

glauca, Chromodoris, Bergh, 31 March 1879, *Malakool. Blätter,* N.F. vol. 1, pp. 106–107.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)27 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1253.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
13 April 1983

OPINION 1254

PROHYSTEROCERAS SPATH, 1921 AND *NEOKENTROCERAS* SPATH, 1921 (CEPHALOPODA, AMMONOIDEA): DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) *Prohysteroceras wordiei* Spath, 1922 is hereby designated as type species of the nominal genus *Prohysteroceras* Spath, 1921

(b) *Neokentroceras curvicornu* Spath, 1922 is hereby designated as type species of the nominal genus *Neokentroceras* Spath, 1921.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Prohysteroceras* Spath, 1921 (gender: neuter), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above, *Prohysteroceras wordiei* Spath, 1922 (Name Number 2195);

(b) *Neokentroceras* Spath, 1921 (gender: neuter), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Neokentroceras curvicornu* Spath, 1922 (Name Number 2196).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *wordiei* Spath, 1922, as published in the binomen *Prohysteroceras wordiei* (specific name of type species of *Prohysteroceras* Spath, 1921 (Name Number 2862);

(b) *curvicornu* Spath, 1922, as published in the binomen *Neokentroceras curvicornu* (specific name of type species of *Neokentroceras* Spath, 1921 (Name Number 2863).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2254

An application for the designation of type species for the ammonite genera *Prohysteroceras* Spath, 1921 and *Neokentroceras* Spath, 1921 was first received from Dr C. W. Wright and Mr M. R. Cooper (*Department of Geology and Mineralogy, Oxford University*) on 6 March 1978. It was sent to the printer on 23 March 1979 and published on 1 July 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 37–39. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general serials, three malacological serials and two palaeontological serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)28 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 38, 39. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Uéno, Willink, Sabrosky, Corliss, Halvorsen, Schuster, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Dupuis, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Cogger, Ride

Negative Vote — Savage.

Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Binder and Lehtinen.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Sabrosky: 'Although it does not affect the thrust of the application, I may note a disagreement with the authors' conclusion that "*A. goodhalli* is, under the Code, the type species of *Prohysteroceras* by monotypy". In my view there were two originally included nominal species, *goodhalli* and *candollianus*.'

Savage: 'I appreciate the difficulties here, but balk at *ex post facto* designation of type species whose names were nomina nuda when the generic names were proposed. The applicants do not spell out the alternatives, which might not lead to too much change if one of the originally included species were designated as the type, especially in *Prohysteroceras*.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

curvicornu, Neokentroceras, Spath, 1922, *Trans. r. Soc. Edinburgh*, vol. 53, p. 139

Neokentroceras Spath, 1921, *Ann. South African Mus.*, vol. 12, p. 306

Prohysteroceras Spath, 1921, *Ann. South African Mus.*, vol. 12, p. 286

wordiei, Prohysteroceras, Spath, 1922, *Trans. r. Soc. Edinburgh*, vol. 53, p. 143.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast in V.P.(82)28 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken,

being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1254.

R V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
13 April 1983

OPINION 1255

LESPESIA ROBINEAU-DESVOIDY, 1863 (DIPTERA, TACHINIDAE): DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers *Achaetoneura anisotae* Webber, 1930, is hereby designated as the type species of *Lespesia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863.

(2) The generic name *Lespesia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Achaetoneura anisotae* Webber, 1930, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2197.

(3) The specific name *anisotae* Webber, 1930, as published in the binomen *Achaetoneura anisotae* (specific name of type species of *Lespesia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2864.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2234

An application for the designation of a type species for *Lespesia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863, was first received from Dr C. W. Sabrosky (*Systematic Entomology Lab USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*) on 11 October 1977. A revised draft was sent to the printer on 16 February 1978 and published on 31 May 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 243–247. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general serials and eight entomological serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)29 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 246. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Uéno, Willink, Corliss, Halvorsen, Schuster, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Cogger, Ride

Negative Vote — Savage.

Dupuis and Sabrosky abstained. Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. Binder and Lehtinen returned no votes.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Savage: 'My reluctance to accept this proposal stems from the uncertainties regarding the distinction between *datanarum, anisotae* and a possible third species reared from *Datana* (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 245). Thus the type species of *Lespesia* "may or may not be "*anisotae*, which form "may or may not prove to be equal to *datanarum*", yet if *anisotae* is selected as the type a possible misidentification occurs.'

Dupuis: 'Je suis en faveur de la conservation de *Lespesia*.

'Je suis cependant hostile à la solution proposée, qui consiste à sacrifier un type authentique existant à des synonymies douteuses, en passant outre aux incertitudes sur la spécificité parasitaire des espèces.

'Le matériel-type de Robineau existe toujours; il s'agit d'un mâle "in sehr gutem Zustand und . . . vom Autor eigenhändig bezettelt" (Mesnil, 1950, p. 108) et "les caractères génériques on été décrits d'après ce mâle" (Robineau, 1863, p. 569).

'Les synonymies *ciliata* mâle R.D./*datanarum* fémelle Townsend/*anisotae* mâle Webber/*datanarum* mâle Beneway sont incertaines (cf. Sabrosky, p. 245).

'Les spécificités parasitaires — qui, souvent, chez les Tachinaires, ont une réelle signification taxinomique — ne sont pas suffisamment établies, ni chez *anisotae*, ni chez *datanarum*, ni, bien entendu, chez *ciliata* R.D. A propos de cette dernière espèce, Sabrosky a beaucoup trop résumé les dires de Robineau et ceux de Mesnil.

'Robineau (p. 569) (sans contradiction, car il est de règle chez les Tachinaires parasites de Lépidoptères que la larve se développe dans la chenille et éclose de la chrysalide) a écrit: "la larve de la seule espèce connue a vécu dans une chenille indéterminée" et "le mâle de cette espèce que je possède, est éclos chez moi d'une chrysalide de *Bombyx* que je n'ai pu déterminer". A cette époque et sous cette forme, le nom de genre *Bombyx* peut désigner toute espèce possible de la famille.

'Mesnil a tenté d'expliquer la provenance de l'hôte indéterminé de Robineau par l'engouement, réel en France à l'époque, pour l'introduction de Bombycides séricigènes exotiques. Ayant examiné un autre exemplaire de "diese selbe *Lespesia*" provenant d'une chrysalide de *Philosamia cynthiae*, il a pensé que cette espèce pourrait être l'hôte du mâle de Robineau. Ce scénario n'est pas certain car si "irgend jemand" avait, à Robineau, "einige Puppen von *Philosamia cynthiae* geschenkt", Robineau eut connu la détermination de cette espèce alors très populaire.

'Pour éviter tout risque de confusion, il conviendrait de maintenir comme type du genre l'espèce de Robineau, avec le spécimen-type et le nom utilisés par lui. Pour cela, il suffit, en vertu des pleins pouvoirs, de considérer le nom de *ciliata* R.D. comme un nom original, en déclarant nulle la synonymie avec la combinaison "*masicera ciliata* Macq. — Collect. du Museum" (R.D. p. 569). Cette combinaison était, pour

Robineau, un nom manuscrit, dont il n'avait "trouvé nulle part la description" (p. 571) (effectivement, elle n'a jamais été publiée et l'on ne connait de Macquart que *Erycia cilata* et *Senometopia ciliata*).

'L'intérêt d'une telle solution a été entrevu par Sabrosky: je la propose formellement ici. La Commission peut utiliser ses pleins pouvoirs pour ouvrir un nouveau vote à ce sujet.

'Dans tous les cas, en tant que connaisseur des difficultés de la taxinomie des Tachinaires lorsque les données biologiques sont insuffisantes, je vote contre *anisotae* ou *datanarum.*'

Dr Sabrosky replied to this comment as follows: Dr Dupuis has laid great stress on the 'synonymies douteuses' and 'incertaines', the 'incertitudes' of host specificity, and the 'données biologiques insuffisantes'. It is unfortunate that, before the voting on my application, I did not call attention to my discussion of the species and my revised key to *Lespesia* (Sabrosky, 1980). It is thus unfortunate that Dupuis did not see this, because the confusion he sees from the doubtful synonymies, etc., does not now exist.

In the past, certainly, the male specimen of '*ciliata*' upon which the generic description was clearly based had a checkered career. It was at first unrecognised (Mesnil, 1939) and then successively identified as *hesperus* Brauer & Bergenstamm (now *frenchii*) (by Mesnil, 1950), *samiae* Webber (by Beneway, 1963, based on Byers' examination of the then undissected male), *datanarum* Townsend (by Herting, 1974, from Arnaud's examination of the male genitalia, never before dissected), and finally *anisotae* Webber (by Sabrosky, 1979, 1980, after determination of the uniqueness in the genus *Lespesia* of the male genitalia of *anisotae*). I do not wonder that this sequence of identifications appeared to Dupuis to be confusing, but this was a series of misidentifications that I was able finally to clarify, a series that gradually progressed toward a solution.

In actual fact, the application as at first submitted to the Secretary proposed *datanarum* as the type species, following Beneway, 1963, who synonymised *anisotae* under *datanarum* because of his erroneous association of males and females. Incidentally, Beneway's figure of the male genitalia of *ciliata* proved to fit the male of *samiae*! Later, when I had sorted out the confusion and recognised the uniqueness of the male genitalia of *anisotae* ('*ciliata*'), I asked to have the still unpublished application changed to request *anisotae* as type species, and this was done. What I should also have done, two years later, was to have submitted a note on my published revision.

Now the doubtful and uncertain synonymies do not exist. Discrimination of the species in this large and difficult genus of TACHINIDAE has long been difficult, especially of females (and the lectotype of *datanarum* is a female), but the successive revisions of Webber, 1930, Beneway, 1963, and Sabrosky, 1980, have clarified the problems, each contributing significant steps on which the others have

built. The male genitalia of *anisotae* proved to be unique in the genus and easily recognised, and the male of 'ciliata Macq. of R.D.' is clearly *anisotae,* as recognised from dissection of the male genitalia by Arnaud, and is neither *frenchii, samiae,* nor *datanarum* as previously misidentified. At the time of the application I could not distinguish the females of *anisotae* and *datanarum,* which might have been conspecific, but later I solved that problem and properly associated males with females of *datanarum* and showed the distinctness of those species.

Host specificity: Contrary to Dupuis' opinion that 'les données biologiques sont insuffisantes', the biologies are better known than he realises, and certainly well enough known that in my opinion they are irrelevant in this case. Few tachinids are *exclusively* parasitic on one host, even though they may be host specific to a high degree. Even such a one-species parasite as *Blepharipa pratensis* (Meigen) (*scutellata* R.D.), a common parasite of the gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar* (Linnaeus), is known from at least two other hosts in Europe and from at least five native lepidopterous hosts in the United States, all rare and probably accidental hosts.

Some species of *Lespesia* are polyphagous, others are quite host specific although occasionally a stray host of another species will be attacked. In particular a species such as *anisotae,* which usually parasitises the saturniid *Anisota,* may attack other saturniids. I would not consider it at all strange that it should attack *Philosamia cynthiae* in France, especially in the absence of its native American host. The fact remains that *Lespesia* is a New World genus, not native to France and apparently not established there. Any host record in France would have been an accidental occurrence.

I have long admired Robineau-Desvoidy as a dipterist far ahead of his time, and I have defended him in print (Sabrosky, 1974), but in the case of *Lespesia* it is unfortunate that he did not recognise the history of Macquart's *ciliata* in the works of Macquart, 1834, 1835, 1849, and 1850, all certainly available to him. I see no credit or justice in assigning the name *ciliata* to him. Robineau-Desvoidy cannot of course be blamed for Macquart's misidentification of his own species!

Referring to the combination *Masicera ciliata* Macquart, Dupuis states that 'effectively, it has never been published and one knows from Macquart only *Erycia ciliata* and *Senometopia ciliata.*' But Dupuis has overlooked Macquart, 1850, who cited *ciliata* in synonymy under *Masicera scutellata* and thus did refer his *ciliata* to *Masicera.* Furthermore, Rondani, 1856, in proposing his new genus *Blepharipa* designated as type species '*Masicera ciliata* Macq.'

I consider then that there is no 'risque de confusion' as Dupuis believes, and I would prefer to see *anisotae* declared the type, which is the species that was before Robineau-Desvoidy when he proposed the name *Lespesia.* If anything, use of the name *ciliata,* which has appeared in combination with *Erycia, Senometopia, Masicera,* and *Lespesia* and

which has in the past been considered synonymous with four different species of *Lespesia*, is by far the more confusing.

REFERENCES

References were published with the application, except for the following.

MESNIL, L. P. 1939. Essai sur les Tachinaires (Larvaevoridae). [France] *Min. de l'Agr., Cent. Natl. de Rech. Agron., Versailles*, Monog. [7], pp. 1–67.

RONDANI, C. 1856. *Dipterologiae Italicae Prodromus*. vol. 1, 228 pp.

SABROSKY, C. W. 1974. In defense of Robineau-Desvoidy. *Mosquito Systematics* vol. 6, pp. 220–1.

——1979. [The application re *Lespesia*].

——1980. A revised key to the Nearctic species of *Lespesia* (Diptera: Tachinidae). *Ann. entomol. Soc. Amer.* vol. 73, pp. 63–73.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

anisotae, Achaetoneura, Webber, 1930, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.*, vol. 78(10), p. 13

Lespesia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863, *Hist. nat. Diptères environs de Paris*, p. 567.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)29 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1255.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
13 April 1983

LARENTIA CAPITATA HERRICH–SCHÄFFER, 1839 AND *PHALAENA CORACINA* ESPER, 1805 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION Z.N.(S.) 2367

By Kauri Mikkola (*Zoological Museum, University of Helsinki, Finland*)

In this application it is proposed that the names in general current use for two species of Geometrid moths, *Ecliptopera capitata* (Herrich–Schäffer, 1839) and *Psodos coracina* (Esper, 1805), be granted nomenclatural precedence over their unused senior synonyms, *Phalaena posticata* Fabricius, 1794 and *Phalaena hirtata* Fabricius, 1794, respectively.

A. *Larentia capitata* Herrich–Schäffer, 1839

2. The nominal species *Phalaena posticata* was described by Fabricius, 1794, p. 196, from Danish material (Selandia) in the Sehestedt & Tønder Lund's collection. The only specimen in that collection (Zimsen, 1964, p. 572, No. 1289) is a female in good condition, bearing a label 'posticata' in an unknown handwriting (Tuxen, 1959, p. 348; Karsholt & Nielsen, 1976a, p. 242). The specimen was designated as lectotype of *Phalaena posticata* Fabricius, 1794 by Mikkola, 1981, p. 433.

3. The lectotype was without difficulty determined by its outer appearance as the species currently known as *Ecliptopera capitata* (Herrich–Schäffer, 1839, pl. 3) and the determination was ascertained by a genital preparation (slide ESN No. 2108 ♀) kindly made by Dr E. Schmidt Nielsen, Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen. However, the description by Fabricius is in itself sufficient for determination as it refers to the most distinctive character of the species: 'Corpus flavescens'. This is conspicuous in the lectotype. The overlooking of the name is partly due to a misidentification by Aurivillius, 1897, p. 166, who incorrectly synonymised the name with *E. silaceata* (Denis & Schiffermüller, 1775, p. 113).

4. The specific name *capitata* Herrich–Schäffer is in general current use, and, from the nineteenth century on, the only name used for this species (e.g. Nolcken, 1867, p. 192; Aurivillius, 1888–91, p. 252; Spuler, 1910, p. 65; Vorbrodt & Müller-Rutz, 1914, p. 98; Prout, 1915, p. 152; Nordström *et al.*, 1941, p. 264; Valle, 1946, p. 178; Bergmann, 1955, p. 435; Hoffmeyer, 1966, p. 148; Forster & Wohlfahrt, 1975, p. 122; Karsholt & Nielsen, 1976b, p. 55; Koch, 1976, p. 171; Mersheyevskaya *et al.*, 1976, p. 66; Jalava, 1977, p. 35; Leraut, 1980, p. 138). As far as I know, the specific name *posticata* F. has since Fabricius never been used as the valid name for the taxon in question.

B. *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805

5. The nominal species *Phalaena hirtata* was described by Fabricius, 1794, p. 181 from Italian material. A single male is present in the so-called Kiel collection which was Fabricius's own collection. Zimsen, 1964, p. 572, No. 1277, lists the name, but, for an unknown reason, does not mention the specimen. Because the specimen fits well with the description by Fabricius and as its position in the collection is appropriate, it was regarded as a syntype and designated as lectotype by Mikkola, 1981, p. 435.

6. The lectotype is a quite normal unicolorous specimen of the species currently known as *Psodos coracina* (Esper, 1805, p. 74). The determination was ascertained from a genital preparation (slide ESN No. 2107 ♂) kindly made by Dr E. Schmidt Nielsen. The description by Fabricius conforms exactly with the lectotype but does not exclude several closely related species.

7. The specific name *coracina* Esper is in general current use and, as far as I know, the only one used as valid for this taxon in this century (e.g. Aurivillius, 1888–91, p. 215; Aro, 1900, p. 201; Spuler, 1910, p. 111; Vorbrodt & Müller–Rutz, 1914, p. 186; Prout, 1915, p. 637; Wehrli, 1921, p. 155; Nordström *et al.*, 1941, p. 310; Kloet & Hincks, 1945, p. 107; Valle, 1946, p. 322; South, 1948, p. 321; Jalava, 1977, p. 40; Fletcher, 1979, p. 8; Leraut, 1980, p. 150; Forster & Wohlfahrt, 1981, p. 284). The specific name *hirtata* F. seems since Fabricius never to have been used as a valid name.

8. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to give
   (a) the specific name *capitata* Herrich–Schäffer, 1839, as published in the binomen *Larentia capitata* Herrich–Schäffer, 1839, nomenclatural precedence over its senior subjective synonym *posticata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena posticata* Fabricius, 1794;
   (b) the specific name *coracina* Esper, 1805, as published in the binomen *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805, nomenclatural precedence over its senior subjective synonym *hirtata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena hirtata* Fabricius, 1794;

(2) to place the following names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *capitata* Herrich–Schäffer, 1839, as published in the binomen *Larentia capitata* Herrich–Schäffer, 1839, with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *posticata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena posticata*

Fabricius, 1794 whenever the two names are treated as synonyms;

(b) *posticata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena posticata* Fabricius, 1794, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *capitata* Herrich–Schäffer, 1839, as published in the binomen *Larentia capitata* Herrich–Schäffer, 1839, whenever the two names are treated as synonyms;

(c) *coracina* Esper, 1805, as published in the binomen *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805, with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over *hirtata* Fabricius, 1794, whenever the two names are treated as synonyms;

(d) *hirtata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena hirtata* Fabricius, 1794, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *coracina* Esper, 1805, as published in the binomen *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805, whenever the two names are treated as synonyms.

REFERENCES

ARO, J. E. 1900. *Suomen perhoset.* [Finnish Lepidoptera]. Helsinki, pp. 1–290.

AURIVILLIUS, CH. 1888–91. *Nordens fjärilar.* Stockholm, pp. 1–277.

———1897. Bemerkungen zu den von J. Chr. Fabricius aus Dänischen Sammlungen beschriebenen Lepidopteren. *Entomol. Tidsk.* vol. 1897, pp. 139–174.

BERGMANN, A. 1955. *Die Grosse-Schmetterlinge Mitteldeutschlands.* Band 5/1. Leipzig, pp. 1–560.

DENIS, M. & SCHIFFERMÜLLER, I. 1775. *Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von der Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend.* Wien, pp. 1–322.

ESPER, E. J. CH. 1805. *Die europäischen Schmetterlinge in Abbildungen nach der Natur mit Beschreibungen.* Teil 4, Abschn. 2. Erlangen, pp. 1–85.

FABRICIUS, J. C. 1794. *Entomologia systematica emendata et aucta.* Tom. 3, pars 2. Hafniae, pp. 1–349.

FLETCHER, D. S. 1979. *The generic names of the moths of the world.* vol. 3. London, pp. 1–243.

FORSTER, W. & WOHLFAHRT, TH. A. 1975, 1981. *Die Schmetterlinge Mitteleuropas.* Heft 26, Heft 29–30. Stuttgart. pp. 97–128, 241–312.

HERRICH–SCHÄFFER, G. A. W. 1839, *Deutschlands Insekten.* Heft 165. Regensburg, 24 col. plates.

HOFFMEYER, S. 1966. *De dånske malere.* 2den udgave. Aarhus, pp. 1–361.

JALAVA, J. 1977. *Suomen perhosten luettelo.* [Check-list of Finnish Lepidoptera]. Helsinki, pp. 1–70.

KARSHOLT, O. & NIELSEN, E. S. 1976a. Notes on some Lepidoptera described by Linnaeus, Fabricius and Ström. *Ent. scand.* vol. 7, pp. 241–251.

———1976b. *Systematisk fortegnelse over Danmarks sommerfugle.* Klampenborg, pp. 1–128.

KLOET, G. S. & HINCKS, W. D. 1945. *A check-list of British insects.* Stockport, pp. 1–483.

KOCH, M., HEINICKE, W. & MÜLLER, B. 1976. *Wir bestimmen Schmetterlinge.* Leipzig, pp. 1–291.

LERAUT, P. 1980. *Liste systématique et synonymique des Lépidoptères de France, Belgique et Corse.* Paris, pp. 1–334.

MERSHEYEVSKAYA, O. I., LITVINOVA, A. N. & MOLCHANOVA, R. V. 1976. *Cheshuekrylye.* Lepidoptera. *Belorussia* [Catalog]. Minsk, pp. 1–130.

MIKKOLA, K. 1981. Notes on Geometrid and Noctuid species described by J. C. Fabricius (Lepidoptera). *Ent. Scand.* vol. 12, pp. 433–436.

NOLCKEN, J. H. W. 1867. *Lepidopterologische Fauna von Estland, Livland und Kurland.* pp. 1–849.

NORDSTROM, F., WAHLGREN, E. & TULLGREN, A. 1941. *Svenska fjärilar.* Stockholm, pp. 1–353.

PROUT, L. B. 1915, in: SEITZ, A. *Die Gross–Schmetterlinge der Erde.* vol. IV. Stuttgart, pp. 1–479.

SOUTH, R. 1948. *The moths of the British Isles.* II ser. repr. London, pp. 1–399.

SPULER, A. 1910. *Die Schmetterlinge Europas.* vol. II. Stuttgart, pp. 1–523.

STAUDINGER, O. & REBEL, H. 1901. *Catalog der Lepidopteren des Palaearktischen Faunengebietes.* Berlin, pp. 1–368.

TUXEN, S. L. 1959. Der Entomolog J. C. Fabricius und die Typen der von ihm beschriebenen Arten. *Zool. Anz.* vol. 163, pp. 343–350.

VALLE, K. J. 1946. *Suuperhoset.* vol. IV, Mittarit, Geometrae. Helsinki, pp. 1–370.

VORBRODT, K. & MÜLLER-RUTZ, J. 1914. *Die Schmetterlinge der Schweiz* II Band. Bern, pp. 1–726.

WEHRLI, E. 1921. Monographische Bearbeitung der Gattung Psodos, nach mikroskopischen Untersuchungen der ♂♂ und ♀♀. *Mitt. Scheiz. entomol. Ges.* vol. 13, pp. 143–175.

ZIMSEN, E. 1964. *The type material of I. C. Fabricius.* København, pp. 1–656.

MYA RONDANI, 1850, AND *SOMOMYA* BERTOLONI, 1861 (INSECTA, DIPTERA): DESIGNATION OF TYPE-SPECIES, AND PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *SOMOMYA* UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2127

By Adrian C. Pont (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

This application concerns two generic names in the family CALLIPHORIDAE (Diptera) for which no type species have been designated and for which some confusion over dating exists. One of them poses a potential threat to a well known name in the literature of medico-veterinary entomology. Decisions by the Commission are requested in order to stabilise the existing and well known nomenclature, to ratify designations of type species for the two genera, and to determine the priority of two of the works concerned.

2. Rondani, 1850, p. 175, in a paper on Diptera in the Turin Museum, described the new genus *Mya* and placed it in the group of genera in which Robineau-Desvoidy, in his 1830 system, included the genera *Onesia, Calliphora, Lucilia, Chrysomya* and *Pollenia.* Three species were included in *Mya*: *versicolor* n.sp., from Venezuela; *alia* Robineau-Desvoidy, from San Sebastian Is.; and *semidiaphana* n.sp., from San Sebastian Is.

3. Rondani, 1856, p. 90, included *Mya* in a key to Italian genera, and cited *Musca vomitoria* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species with the statement 'Spec: Typ: Musca Vomitoria Lin.' This is an invalid type species designation, however, as *vomitoria* was not one of the originally included species.

4. Bertoloni, 1861, p. 28, exhibited new Diptera from Mozambique at a meeting of the Academy of Sciences of the Institute of Bologna held on 27 December 1860, and, in anticipation of a more extensive report on these flies, presented brief published descriptions of the new species.

The first two species are *Somomya suturata* and *Somomya subtranslucida,* both of which are briefly described in 5- and 3-line Latin diagnoses respectively. After the descriptions Bertoloni discusses the name *Somomya:* 'Il genere SOMOMYA è nuovo, e formato dal Rondani di Parma...' No generic descriptive matter is given, but the name is made available by its combination with two available specific names (*International Code of Zoological Nomenclature,* Article 16a (v)). There is no mention of *Mya* in Bertoloni's article, and *Somomya* in this context must be regarded as a new genus based on two new species.

5. Rondani, 1861, pp. 8–12, published a list of replacement names for preoccupied generic names discussed in earlier parts of his *Prodromus.* On page 9 he listed *Mya* Rondani as preoccupied by *Mya* Linnaeus, 1758 (Mollusca), and listed 'Somomya R. 1861' as the replacement name, with a footnote 'V. Atti del Accad. delle Scienze di

Bologna 1861'. As the other replacement names in the list are newly proposed and are given the suffix 'm.', it must be concluded that Rondani regarded *Somomya* as already available, although he clearly thought of it as his own name and supposed that Bertoloni's (1861) work was already in print.

6. Bertoloni, 1862, pp. 42–46, published full descriptions of the species he had listed in 1861. He emended *Somomya* to *Somomyia* and attributed the name to Rondani. The species *suturata* was placed in sg. *Pollemia* (sic) Robineau-Desvoidy and *subtranslucida* in sg. *Ochromya* Macquart.

7. It is clearly of importance to establish whether Rondani's or Bertoloni's paper was the first to be published in 1861. If *Somomya* is attributed to Bertoloni, then it refers to two African species. If it is attributed to Rondani, then it refers to three South American species. There is no external evidence as to the dates of publication of these papers. The only evidence is internal, and rests on Bertoloni's statement (1861, p. 28) that *Somomya* 'e formato dal Rondani di Parma ...'; on Rondani's reference to Bertoloni's paper; and on the fact that Rondani credits *Somomya* to 'R. 1861' rather than giving it the suffix 'm' as he does for the other newly-proposed replacement names. But even this is not conclusive, since he may well have known of Bertoloni's paper before publication, and may well have seen his manuscript; and his inclusion of this reference could have been in anticipation of its being published first. However, accepting the facts at their face value, it seems that Bertoloni, 1861 antedates Rondani, 1861, although if there were desirable nomenclatural reasons for doing so it could be argued that the name *Somomya* should be credited to Rondani instead of to Bertoloni ex Rondani MS.

8. The generic names *Mya* and *Somomya* are not mentioned in Catalogues of the Nearctic (James in Stone *et al.*, 1965) or Neotropical (James, 1970) CALLIPHORIDAE. In James' Neotropical catalogue, the species of *Mya* are placed as follows:

versicolor Rondani: not mentioned

alia Robineau-Desvoidy: junior synonym of *Cochliomyia macellaria* (Fabricius, 1775).

semidiaphana Rondani: junior synonym of *Hemilucilia segmentaria* (Fabricius, 1805).

9. There appears to be no valid type species designation for *Mya*. The designation by Rondani, 1856, p. 90, of *vomitoria* is invalid, since *vomitoria* was not one of the originally included species, yet Townsend, 1937, p. 141, and Hall, 1948, p. 103, both cite *vomitoria* as the type by designation of Rondani, 1856, and synonymise *Mya* and *Somomya* Rondani with *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830. Other monographic works such as Senior-White, Aubertin & Smart, 1940, Zumpt, 1956, and Kano & Shinonaga, 1968 also follow Townsend. There is a later designation by Coquillett, 1910, p. 571, of *Musca segmentaria*

Fabricius, but this is also invalid since *segmentaria* is not one of the originally included species, although the name of the third species, *semidiaphana,* is a junior synonym of *segmentaria.* Accepting *Somomya* as a replacement name for *Mya,* Coquillett (1910, p. 606) also listed *segmentaria* as the type species of this genus.

10. In order to fix the identity of the genus *Mya* Rondani, 1850, and in the absence of any previous valid type species designation, the third of Rondani's species *Mya semidiaphana* Rondani, 1850, is herewith designated as type species. *Mya semidiaphana* is a junior synonym of *Musca segmentaria* Fabricius, 1805, and *Mya* Rondani, which is preoccupied by *Mya* Linnaeus, 1758 (Mollusca), thus becomes a senior synonym of *Hemilucilia* Brauer, 1895, but remains invalid because it is a junior homonym.

11. *Somomya* Bertoloni has never been adopted in the African literature for a valid taxon, nor has a type species been designated for it. Of its two original species, *subtranslucida* is a junior synonym of *Auchmeromyia senegalensis* (Macquart, 1851) and *suturata* is a *nomen dubium.* It is therefore desirable to designate *subtranslucida* as type species, and in order to resolve the identity of the genus from the formal point of view, *Somomya subtranslucida* Bertoloni, 1861, is herewith designated as type species.

12. According to the Law of Priority, the generic name *Somomya* Bertoloni, 1861, must now replace the name *Auchmeromyia* Brauer & Bergenstamm, 1891, which is long established in medical and veterinary textbooks and other literature: *Auchmeromyia senegalensis* (Macquart, 1851) is the well known Congo-Floor Maggot. On the other hand, if one were to accept *Somomya* as a Rondani genus (see discussion of dates under paragraphs 4–5 above), then *Somomya* would replace *Hemilucilia* Brauer, 1895, if *semidiaphana* were the type species or, if *alia* were designated, *Cochliomyia* Townsend, 1915, and such a change is equally undesirable since flies of both genera are extremely well known as medical and veterinary pests: *Cochliomyia macellaria* (Fabricius, 1775) and *hominivorax* (Coquerel, 1858) are the New World Screw Worm Flies, whilst *Hemilucilia* includes common species of some hygienic importance. (The status of *Cochliomyia* vis-à-vis *Callitroga* Brauer, 1883 will be considered in a separate application.)

13. In order to preclude undesirable changes of nomenclature, and to preserve the stability of generic names of CALLIPHORIDAE important in medical and veterinary science, the Commission is asked to:

(1) rule that the work of Bertoloni, 1861, has precedence over that of Rondani, 1861, for the purposes of priority;

(2) to use its plenary powers:

(a) to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made

(i) for the nominal genus *Mya* Rondani, 1850, and having done so, to designate *Mya semidiaphana* Rondani, 1850, as type species of that genus;

(ii) for the nominal genus *Somomya* Bertoloni, 1861, and having done so, to designate *Somomya subtranslucida* Bertoloni, 1861 as the type species of that genus;

(b) to suppress the generic name *Somomya* Bertoloni, 1861 ex Rondani, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for the Law of Homonymy;

(3) to place *Hemilucilia* Brauer, 1895 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation *Musca segmentaria* Fabricius, 1805, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology:

(a) *Mya* Rondani, 1850 (a junior homonym of *Mya* Linnaeus, 1758);

(b) *Somomya* Bertoloni, 1861, ex Rondani MS, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (2) (b) above.

(5) to place the specific name *segmentaria* Fabricius, 1805, as published in the binomen *Musca segmentaria* (specific name of type species of *Hemilucilia* Brauer, 1895) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BERTOLONI, G. 1861. [Exhibit and description of new Diptera from Mozambique.] *Rc. Sess. Accad. Sci. Ist. Bologna*, 1860–1861, pp. 28–29.

—— 1862. Illustrazione dei prodotti naturali del Mozambico. Dissertazione intorno ad insetti ditteri. *Memorie R. Accad. Sci. Ist. Cl. Sci. fis. Bologna*, vol. 12 (1), pp. 41–60, 1 plate.

COQUILLETT, D. W. 1910. The Type-species of the North American Genera of Diptera. *Proc. U.S. natn. Mus.*, vol. 37, pp. 499–647.

HALL, D. G. 1948. The Blowflies of North America. *Thomas Say Foundation*, [Volume 4], 477 pp., 46 plates, 5 col. plates, 9 figs.

JAMES, M. T. 1970. Family Calliphoridae. In *A Catalogue of the Diptera of the Americas South of the United States*, vol. 102, 28 pp. São Paulo.

KANO, R., & SHINONAGA, S. 1968. *Fauna Japonica: Calliphoridae (Insecta, Diptera)* vii+181 pp., 23 col. plates, 11+14 figs., 1 table, 2 maps. Biogeographical Society of Japan.

ROBINEAU-DESVOIDY, A. J. B. 1830. Essai sur les Myodaires. *Mém. prés. div. Sav. Acad. Sci. Inst. Fr.*, vol. 2, pp. 1–813.

RONDANI, C. 1850. Osservazioni sopra alquante specie di Esapodi Ditteri del Museo Torinese. *Nuovi Ann. Sci. nat. Bologna (3)*, vol. 2, pp. 165–197, plate 4.

—— 1856. *Dipterologiae Italicae prodromus.* Volume 1, 228 pp. Parmae.

—— 1861. *Dipterologiae Italicae prodromus.* Volume 4, 174 pp. Parmae.

SENIOR-WHITE, R., AUBERTIN, D. & SMART, J. 1940. *The Fauna of British India, including the remainder of the Oriental Region.* Diptera. Vol. VI. Family Calliphoridae. xiii+288 pp., 152 figs., 2 maps. London.

STONE, A., ET AL. [editors]. 1965. A catalog of the Diptera of America North of Mexico. *Agric. Handb., U.S. Dept. Ag.*, vol. 276, 1696 pp.

TOWNSEND, C. H. T. 1937. *Manual of Myiology in twelve parts*, Part V. Muscoid generic diagnoses and data. Glossinini to Agriini. 234pp. São Paulo.

ZUMPT, F. 1956. Calliphoridae (Diptera Cyclorrhapha). Part I: Calliphorini and Chrysomyiini. *Explor. Parc. Natn. Albert Miss. G. F. de Witte.* vol. 87, pp. 1–200, 113 figs.

ANCISTROCEROIDES SAUSSURE, 1855: PROPOSED CHANGE OF TYPE SPECIES IN ORDER TO PRESERVE THE WELL-ESTABLISHED NAME *PARALASTOR* SAUSSURE, 1856 (HYMENOPTERA, VESPOIDEA, EUMENIDAE). Z.N.(S.)2280

By J. van der Vecht, (*Burg. Vermeerlaan 4, 3881 GZ Putten, Netherlands*)

In his monographs of the VESPIDAE H. de Saussure (1853, p. 147) described two species in the 'IIIe Division' ('IIe Division' on p. 146, but corrected on p. 3 of the 'Table des Matières') of the subgenus *Ancistrocerus* Wesmael, 1836, of the genus *Odynerus* Latreille, 1802, viz. *O. alastoroides* from Montevideo and *O. alastoripennis* from Tasmania, both said to be in the Mus. Paris.

2. Shortly afterwards the same author (1855, p. 221) proposed the name *Ancistroceroides* for this division and added two new species to it: *O. cruentus* from Australia and *O. sanguinolentus* from an unknown locality, both based on one or more specimens in the British Museum (Natural History).

3. In a review of the American VESPIDAE de Saussure (1875, p. 211) used the name *Ancistroceroides* for a division of the subgenus *Ancistrocerus* containing a single species: *A. alastoroides* Sauss. (In this work de Saussure divided the genus *Odynerus* into four subgenera, but actually he treated these taxa as genera, using for the species only the initial of the subgenus with the specific name.)

4. In the 'Catalogus Hymenopterorum' Dalla Torre listed *Ancistroceroides* as a subgeneric name (1894, p. 49), and it was used as such by Schrottky (1903, p. 178), who recorded *Odynerus* (*Ancistroceroides*) *alastoroides* (Sauss.) from Argentina. Brèthes (1903, p. 268) regarded *alastoroides* as a probable synonym of *Odynerus clarazianus* Saussure, described in 1870 from Argentina. Since then the specific name *clarazianus* has been used by about a dozen different authors, in combination with *Odynerus,* or in a few cases, *Ancistrocerus.* In view of the present conception of these genera, neither name is correct. The supposed synonymy of *alastoroides* and *clarazianus* can now be established with certainty (unpublished) so that the older name *alastoroides* must be used.

5. When in 1925 Bequaert revised the North American species of the genus *Ancistrocerus,* he also designated type species for some of the subgenera, including *Ancistroceroides* Saussure. He wrote: 'only two species are described in 1856, and of these I designate the first, *Odynerus cruentus* Saussure, 1856, of Australia, as the type'. (Apparently Bequaert overlooked the fact that the two species described by de Saussure in 1853 (see above, first paragraph) were also available for selection as type species of *Ancistroceroides.*)

6. This designation was confirmed by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, when upon my request (Van der Vecht, 1967), it recognised H. de Saussure as the author of several names, proposed by him in the period 1855–1863, for secondary divisions of genera (Opinion 893, 1970). At that time there could not be objections against this proceeding, but lately it has become clear that this designation may have very undesirable consequences.

7. *Odynerus cruentus* Saussure, 1855, was based on a female wasp from 'La Nouvelle Hollande' in the British Museum. The type could not be found there in 1975, and no Eumenid wasp agreeing with de Saussure's description was detected in several collections studied since then. In January 1980, however, Dr R. M. Bohart (*University of California, Davis*), collected in South Australia a series of a *Paralastor* species which is undoubtedly identical with *Odynerus cruentus* Saussure.

8. Consequently it may now be regarded as certain that *Paralastor* Saussure, 1856, is a junior subjective synonym of *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855. This is extremely unfortunate, for the name *Paralastor* has been in general use for a well defined group of Australian wasps ever since R. C. L. Perkins, 1914, raised it to generic rank in a monograph dealing with nearly a hundred species. The number of species known at present is about 130. Moreover this name was placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Opinion 893, when the type species of the genus was fixed as *Odynerus cruentus*.

9. This confusion could best be avoided by rejecting Bequaert's type designation and by selecting as such *Odynerus alastoroides* Saussure. Moreover, this action would have the advantage that the name *Ancistroceroides* thus becomes available again for a small, well-characterized and isolated, at present nameless, group of at least two species of EUMENIDAE inhabiting the southern part of South America. There is no doubt that this group deserves at least subgeneric status.

10. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested to:

(1) use its plenary powers
  (a) to suppress all designations of type species for the genus *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855, made prior to the ruling now requested, and
  (b) to designate *Odynerus alastoroides* Saussure, 1853, as the type species of that genus;
(2) correct the entry under Name Number 1857 in the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology to:
  Ancistroceroides Saussure, 1855 (gender: masculine), type species *Odynerus alastoroides* Saussure, 1853;
(3) place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
  alastoroides Saussure, 1853, as published in the binomen

Odynerus alastoroides (specific name of type species of *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855);

(4) delete the words '(type species of *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855)' from the entry under Name Number 2330 in the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, now reading *'cruentus* Saussure, 1855, as published in the binomen *Odynerus cruentus* (type species of *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855) (Name Number 2330)'.

REFERENCES

BEQUAERT, J. 1925. The genus *Ancistrocerus* in North America, with a partial key to the species. *Trans. Am. entomol. Soc.*, vol. 51, pp. 57–117.

BRETHES, J. 1903. Los Eumenidos de las Républicas del Plata. *An. Mus. nac. B. Aires* vol. 9, pp. 231–320.

DALLA TORRE, C. G. DE 1894. *Catalogus Hymenopterorum* IX, Vespidae (Diploptera). Lipsiae, 181 pp.

GRIFFIN, F. J. 1939. On the dates of publication of Saussure (H. de): Etudes sur la famille des Vespidés 1–3, 1852–1858. *J. Soc. Bibl. nat. Hist.* vol. 1, pp. 211–212.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, 1970. Opinion 893. Eumenidae names of Saussure, etc. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 26, pp. 187–191.

PERKINS, R. C. L. 1914. On the species of *Alastor* (*Paralastor*) Sauss. and some other Hymenoptera of the family Eumenidae. *Proc. zool. Soc. London*, 1914, pp. 563–624, 1 plate.

SAUSSURE, H. DE 1852–1858. Études sur la famille des Vespidés. Geneva and Paris. 1. *Monographie des guêpes solitaires ou de la tribu des Euméniens:* pp. 1–128 (1852), 129–286 (1853): 3. *Supplément à la monographie des guêpes solitaires:* pp. 99–288 (1855), 289–352 (1856). [For the dates of the various parts see Griffin, 1939].

——— 1875. Synopsis of American wasps. *Smiths. misc. Collns* No. 254, XXXV+392 pp., 4 pls.

SCHROTTKY, C. 1903. Enumération des Hyménoptères connus jusqu'ici de la République Argentine, de l'Uruguay et du Paraguay. *An. soc. cient. Argentina.* vol. 55, pp. 80–91, 176–186.

VECHT, J. VAN DER 1967. The status of certain genus-group names in the Eumenidae (Hymenoptera, Vespoidea). *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 24, pp. 27–33.

KASSINA GIRARD, 1853 (AMPHIBIA, ANURA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *EREMIOPHILUS* FITZINGER, 1843 UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2343

By Alain Dubois & Jean-Jacques Morère (*Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*) and Andrew F. Stimson & Barry T. Clarke (*British Museum (Natural History), London SW7 5BD*).

1. *Kassina* Girard (1853, p. 421, type-species, by monotypy, *Cystignathus senegalensis* Duméril & Bibron, 1841, p. 418) has, almost since its inception, been generally accepted as the correct generic name for the species *senegalensis* and its congeners. This genus of African frogs in the family HYPEROLIIDAE now contains some fifteen species. During the last one hundred years *Kassina* (or the unjustified emendation *Cassina*) has been used in well over a hundred publications including the important faunal lists and systematic reviews of Boulenger (1882, p. 131), Ahl (1931, p. 447), Laurent (1941, p. 105), Hoffman (1942, p. 113), Laurent & Combaz (1950, p. 273), Loveridge (1957, p. 320), Perret (1958, p. 1437), Poynton (1964, p. 175), Wager (1965, p. 189), Perret (1966, p. 418), Schiøtz, (1967, p. 67), Stewart (1967, p. 125), Liem, (1970, p. 1), Schiøtz (1975, p. 53), Largen (1975, p. 1), Laurent (1976, p. 31) and Passmore & Carruthers (1979, p. 224).

2. As a result of an application to the Commission by Laurent & Smith (1966) *Kassina* was given precedence over *Hylambates* Duméril, 1853 and was placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology (Opinion 849, I.C.Z.N. 1968) and the name of its type species, *Cystignathus senegalensis* Duméril & Bibron, 1841, was placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology. At the time of this Ruling by the Commission *Hylambates* Duméril (1853, p. 162, type species by monotypy, *Hylambates maculatus* Duméril, 1853, p. 165) should also have been placed on the Official List. This should now be done.

3. *Eremiophilus* Fitzinger (1843, p. 32, type species, by original designation, *Cystignathus senegalensis* Duméril & Bibron, 1841, p. 418) is a senior objective synonym of *Kassina* (Dubois, 1981, p. 261). We can find no instance of Fitzinger's name appearing in the primary zoological literature since its original description.

4. Strict application of the Law of Priority would result in the well established *Kassina* being replaced by *Eremiophilus*, a name unused as a senior synonym since 1843.

5. The Commission is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Eremiophilus* Fitzinger, 1843 for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Hylambates* Duméril, 1853

(gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Hylambates maculatus* Duméril, 1853, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the direction that it not be given preference over *Kassina* Girard, 1853, by any zoologist who considers those names to apply to the same genus-group taxon.

(3) to place the specific name *maculatus* Duméril, 1853 as published in the binomen *Hylambates maculatus* (specific name of type species of *Hylambates* Duméril, 1853) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

(4) to place the generic name *Eremiophilus* Fitzinger, 1843, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

AHL, E. 1931. Amphibia: Anura III. Polypedatidae. *Tierreich* vol. 55, pp. 1–477.

BOULENGER, G. A. 1882. *Catalogue of the Batrachia Salientia s. Ecaudata in the collection of the British Museum.* London, pp. i–xvi, 1–503.

DUBOIS, A. 1981. Liste des genres et sous-genres nominaux de Ranoidea (Amphibiens, Anoures) du Monde, avec identification de leurs espèces-types: conséquences nomenclaturales. *Monitore zool. ital. (Suppl.)* vol. 15, pp. 225–284.

DUMÉRIL, A. 1853. Mémoire sur les Batraciens Anoures, de la famille des Hylaeformes ou rainettes, comprenant la description d'un genre nouveau et de onze espèces nouvelles. *Annls Sci. nat. (Zool.)* vol. 19, pp. 135–179.

DUMÉRIL, A. M. C. & BIBRON, G. 1841. *Erpétologie Générale ou Histoire Naturelle complète des Reptiles.* Paris, vol. 8, 792 pp.

FITZINGER, L. 1843. *Systema Reptilium.* Vienna, pp. 1–106, i–iv.

GIRARD, C. 1853. Descriptions of new species of reptiles, collected by the U.S. Exploring Expedition, under the command of Capt. Charles Wilkes, U.S.N. Second Part—Including the species of Batrachians exotic to North America. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* vol. 6, pp. 420–425.

HOFFMAN, A. C. 1942. Investigations on the anatomical characters of the genus *Kassina*, together with descriptions of the different species and of two new subspecies. *Soöl. Navors. nas. Mus. Bloemfontein* vol. 1, pp. 113–166.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, 1968. Opinion 849. *Kassina* Girard, 1853 (Amphibia): grant under the plenary powers of precedence over *Hylambates* Duméril, 1853. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 25, pp. 20–22.

LARGEN, M. J. 1975. The status of the genus *Kassina* (Amphibia Anura Hyperoliidae) in Ethiopia. *Monitore zool. ital. (Suppl.)* vol. 6, pp. 1–28.

LAURENT, R. F. 1941. Contribution à l'ostéologie et à la systématique des Rhacophorides africains. Première note. *Revue Zool. Bot. afr.* vol. 35, pp. 85–111.

——— 1976. Les Genres *Cryptothylax, Phlyctimantis* et *Kassina* au Zaïre. *Annls Mus. r. Afr. cent. (8° Sci. zool.)* vol. 213, pp. 1–67.

——— & COMBAZ, J. 1950. Sur l'attribution générique de certains Batraciens appartenant à la sous-famille des Hyperoliinae. *Revue Zool. Bot. afr.* vol. 43, pp. 269–280.

——— & SMITH, H. M. 1966. *Kassina* Girard, 1853 (Amphibia: Anura): proposed grant of priority over *Hylambates* Duméril, 1853. Z.N.(S.)1718. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 22, pp. 317–318.

LIEM, S. S. 1970. The morphology, systematics and evolution of the Old World treefrogs (Rhacophoridae and Hyperoliidae). *Fieldiana Zool.* vol. 57, pp. i–vii, 1–145.

LOVERIDGE, A. 1957. Checklist of the reptiles and amphibians of East Africa (Uganda; Kenya; Tanganyika; Zanzibar). *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harv.* vol. 117, pp. 151–362.

PASSMORE, N. I. & CARRUTHERS, V. C. 1979. *South African Frogs.* Johannesburg, pp. i–xvii, 1–270.

PERRET, J.-L. 1958. Notes sur des Batraciens du genre *Kassina* du Cameroun et d'Afrique nord-équatoriale. *Bull. Inst. fr. Afr. noire (A)* vol. 20, pp. 1437–1447.

——— 1966. Les Amphibiens du Cameroun. *Zool. Jb. (Syst.)* vol. 8, pp. 289–464.

POYNTON, J. C. 1964. The Amphibia of Southern Africa. *Ann. Natal Mus.* vol. 17, pp. 1–334.

SCHIØTZ, A. 1967. The treefrogs (Rhacophoridae) of West Africa. *Spolia zool. Mus. haun.* vol. 25, pp. 1–346.

——— 1975. *The treefrogs of Eastern Africa.* Copenhagen, pp. 1–232.

STEWART, M. M. 1967. *Amphibians of Malawi.* New York, pp. i–ix, 1–163.

WAGER, V. A. 1965. *The frogs of South Africa.* Johannesburg, pp. 1–242.

SIMIA FASCICULARIS RAFFLES, 1821 (MAMMALIA, PRIMATES): REQUEST FOR THE SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF *SIMIA AYGULA* LINNAEUS, 1758, A SENIOR SYNONYM. Z.N.(S.) 2399

By P. H. Napier (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) and C. P. Groves (*Department of Prehistory and Anthropology SGS, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia*)

On the authority of Thomas & Wroughton (1909, *Proc. zool. Soc. London*, p. 373), the name *Simia aygula* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* vol. 1, p. 27) has for many years been considered to be a Javan Leaf Monkey, antedating *Presbytis mitrata* Eschscholtz, 1821 (in Kotzebue, *Entdeckungs-Reise in die Süd-See*, vol. 3, p. 196, pl., type species of the genus *Presbytis* Eschscholtz, 1821).

2. Linnaeus' diagnosis and description are as follows:

"S. caudata subbarbata grisea, eminentia pilosa verticis longitudinali.

Osb. iter. 99.

Habitat in India. *Osbeck.*

Corpus griseum lupi coloris, subtus gula, pectore, abdomineque albicans. Cauda corpore longior, cinerea, attenuata. Facies planiuscula, albida, nuda. Nasus depressus, brevissimus, ab ore remotus, lacuna labii superioris gemina. Bucca subbarbata, longitudine menti subbarbati. Supercilia frontis gibba, prominentia. Pedes nigri: Ungues pollicum rotundati; reliqui oblongi. Auriculae acutiusculae."

['Tailed, somewhat bearded grey monkey, with a longitudinal hairy eminence on the crown.

Lives in India.

Body grey, wolf-coloured, under throat, chest and abdomen becoming white. Tail longer than body, ashy-grey, slender. Face flattish, whitish, naked. Nose flat, very short, remote from mouth, with twin grooves on the upper lip. Cheek rather bearded, along the chin rather bearded. Brows swollen, prominent. Feet black: nails rounded on thumb; remainder oblong. Ears rather pointed.']

This description comes almost entirely from two sources: (1) Osbeck's description of a young animal ('the size of a small cat') which he collected in Java (1757, *Ostindisk Resa*, p. 99), and of other 'Jawanska markattor' which he saw in Java, and (2) from Osbeck's description of a live adult male 'markatta' belonging to Burgomaster Renhorn of Arboga in Sweden (unpublished letters from Osbeck to Linnaeus, 13th May and 27th June, 1756, in the Linnaean Society Archives).

3. Many of the features in Linnaeus' diagnosis are incompatible with its interpretation as a Javan Leaf Monkey; most crucial, however,

is a character not mentioned by Linnaeus, but coming from Osbeck's description of his Javan specimen: the crest on the crown is stated to be the same colour as the rest of the body (grey or grey yellow). This absolutely rules out the grey Javan *Presbytis* with its contrasting black-crested head. The latter species can in any case be excluded on the grounds that no Leaf Monkey could at that time have been brought alive to Europe and survived to adulthood. A few quotations may also be given from J. R. Forster's translation of Osbeck (published in 1771 as *A voyage to China and the East Indies*) to show the ineptness of identifying the 'Jawanska markattor' with any Leaf Monkey: 'They ... embrace one another ... They play with dogs if they have no nearer friends about them... They make a continual noise during the night time... If any body looks at them, they are angry, and begin a smacking. They resemble all others of this genus in dirtyness, lasciviousness, drollery...'

4. Unfortunately no type material is available to confirm the identification at either the Zoologiska Museet in Uppsala or the Naturhistoriska Riksmuseet in Stockholm.

5. *Simia aygula* is quite clearly the Crab-eating or Long-tailed Macaque, as Buffon indeed opined as early as 1766 (*Hist. nat.* vol. 14, pp. 190–191, footnote). He allied it with his 'Aigrette', which is probably the derivation of *aygula*, signifying a little crest. At present the name used for the Crab-eater is *Macaca fascicularis* (Raffles, 1821, *Trans. linn. Soc. London*, vol. 13, p. 246). Other names used in recent years for this taxon are (1) *Macaca cynamolgos* (Linnaeus, 1758) which was mistakenly applied to the Crab-eating Macaque following Schreber (1774, *Säugthiere*, vol. 1, p. 91, pl. 13) which unites Linnaeus' description of the hamadryas baboon with an engraving of Buffon's 'Macaque'; and (2) [*Macaca*] *Irus* (F. Cuvier, 1818, *Mem. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris*, vol. 4, p. 120), rightly rejected as unavailable by both Miller (1942, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia* vol. 94, pp. 127–128) and Fooden (1964, *Science, New York*, vol. 143, p. 365) because not published in a binomen. It would seriously impair scientific communication if the name of this species should be changed yet again, as is required by the Law of Priority.

6. The International Commission is therefore requested to
   (a) use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *aygula* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Simia aygula*, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
   (b) place *fascicularis* Raffles, 1821, as published in the binomen *Simia fascicularis*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology; and
   (c) place the name suppressed in (1) above on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

ALLYGUS FIEBER, 1872 (INSECTA, HOMOPTERA): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES. Z.N.(S.)2431

By Frej Ossiannilsson (*Källparksgatan 9, Uppsala S-754 32 Sweden*)

I propose that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature suppress all designations of type species made for the genus *Allygus* Fieber, 1872 prior to that made by Van Duzee, 1917. The purpose of the application is to preserve current usage of the names *Allygus* Fieber, 1872 and *Allygidius* Ribaut, 1948. The details of the case are set out below.

2. Fieber, 1872, listed the European Homoptera Auchenorrhyncha. On p. 13 he listed 21 species, subspecies and synonyms under *Allygus*. The list included *Allygus atomarius* "Ger." (i.e. Fabricius, 1794), *Allygus mixtus* "Ger." (i.e. Fabricius, 1794) and nine nomina nuda. No description of the genus *Allygus* was given in that paper.

3. Fieber, 1875, p. 410, erected *Allygus* as a 'new genus' in a key of genera. No species were mentioned.

4. Van Duzee, 1916, p. 73, designated *Allygus atomarius* (F.) (= *Cicada atomaria* Fabricius, 1794) as type species of *Allygus* Fieber, 1875.

5. Van Duzee, 1917, p. 675, designated *Cicada mixta* Fabricius as the type species of *Allygus* 'Scott' (sic). The reason for this was obviously that he regarded Scott, 1876, not Fieber as the author of *Allygus*. In Scott's paper only *mixtus* "Germar" (i.e. Fabricius) and *commutatus* Fieber were mentioned; *atomarius* "Kirschb." was included as a synonym of *commutatus*.

6. Ribaut, 1948, divided *Allygus* into three genera: *Allygidius* gen. nov. (type species *'Cercopis' atomaria* (F., 1794) = *Cicada atomaria* Fabricius, 1794); *Mimallygus* gen. nov. (type species *Jassus lacteinervis* Kirschbaum, 1868) and *Allygus* Fieber with type species *Jassus* (sic) *mixtus* F., 1794 = *Cicada mixta* Fabricius, 1794. It appears that Ribaut overlooked the oldest valid type-species designation by Van Duzee, 1916. This makes *Allygidius* Ribaut a junior objective synonym of *Allygus* Fieber, 1872. In spite of this, practically all authors have adopted the nomenclature established by Ribaut (see References).

7. Emelyanov, 1966, erected *Syringius* as a new subgenus of *Allygus* with type species *Allygus syrinx* Dlabola, 1961. That subgenus is then congeneric with *Allygus* if *Cicada mixta* Fabricius, 1794 is its type species.

8. If the Code is strictly applied, *Allygidius* Ribaut, 1948, must be treated as a junior objective synonym of *Allygus* Fieber, 1872. The generic concept of *Allygus* Ribaut *non* Fieber will be called *Syringius*, but the subgenus of which *Cicada mixta* Fabricius, 1794 is the type species will be left without a name. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designation of type species made for *Allygus* Fieber, 1872 prior to the designation by Van Duzee, 1917, of *Cicada mixta* Fabricius, 1794 as type species of that genus;

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Allygus* Fieber, 1872 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Van Duzee, 1917 as ratified under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Cicada mixta* Fabricius, 1794;

(b) *Allygidius* Ribaut, 1948 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Cicada atomaria* Fabricius, 1794;

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *mixta* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Cicada mixta* (specific name of type species of *Allygus* Fieber, 1872);

(b) *atomaria* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Cicada atomaria* (specific name of type species of *Allygidius* Ribaut, 1948).

REFERENCES

EMELYANOV, A. F. 1966. New palaearctic and certain nearctic cicads (Homoptera Auchenorrhyncha). *Rev. entomol. URSS.* vol. 45, pp. 95–133.

FABRICIUS, J. C. 1794. *Entomologia systematica*, vol. 4, 472 pp. Hafniae.

FIEBER, F. X. 1872. *Katalog der Europäischen Cicadinen, nach Originalen mit Benützung der neuesten Literatur*, iv + 19 pp. Wien.

——— 1875. Les Cicadines d'Europe d'après les originaux et les publications les plus récentes, première partie. *Rev. Mag. Zool.* vol. 3 (3), pp. 288–416.

RIBAUT, H. 1948. Démembrement de quelques genres de Jassidae (Homoptera). *Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Toulouse*, vol. 83, pp. 57–59.

SCOTT, J. 1876. On certain British Hemiptera-Homoptera (*Athysanus*). *Entomol. mon. Mag.*, vol. 12, pp. 169–172.

VAN DUZEE, E. P. 1916. *Check list of Hemiptera (except the Aphididae, Aleurodidae and Coccidae) of America north of Mexico*, 111 pp. New York.

——— 1917. Catalogue of the Hemiptera of America north of Mexico except the Aphididae, Coccidae and Aleurodidae. *California Agric. Exper. Sta. entomol. tech. Bull.* vol. 2, xiv + 902 pp.

The names *Allygus* Fieber and *Allygidius* Ribaut are treated as denoting separate genera in the following major publications:

EMELYANOV, A. F. 1964. Podotrjad Cicadinea (Auchenorrhyncha)—tsikadovye. *In Opredelitel nasekomych evropejskoj chasti SSSR*, vol. 1, pp. 337–437.

LE QUESNE, W. J. 1969. Hemiptera (Cicadomorpha — Deltocephalinae). *Handbooks ident. British insects.* vol. 2, part 2(b), pp. 65–148. London.
MITJAEV, D. 1971. Leafhoppers of Kazakhstan (Homoptera — Cicadinea). *The Determinant.* pp. 1–212. Alma Ata.
NAST, J. 1976. Piewiki Auchenorrhyncha (Cicadodea). *Cat. faunae Poloniae,* vol. 21: 1, pp. 1–256.
RIBAUT, H. 1952. Homoptères auchenorrhynches II (Jassidae). *Faune de France,* vol. 57, pp. 1–256. Paris.
SERVADEI, A. 1967. Rhynchota (Heteroptera, Homoptera, Auchenorrhyncha) catalogo topografico et sinonimico. *Fauna d'Italia,* vol. 9, x+851 pp. Bologna.
(A list of references to 38 works by 21 different authors between 1950 and 1981 who use *Allygidius* Ribaut as a valid generic name is held in the Secretariat. R.V.M.)

This application is supported by Professor R. H. Cobben (*Department of Entomology, Wageningen*), Dr Walter J. Le Quesne (*Chesham, Bucks, U.K.*), Dr Janusz Nast (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) and Dr Rauno E. Linnavuori (SF-21220 Somersoja, Finland).

MACTRA SACHALINENSIS SCHRENK, 1862 (MOLLUSCA, BIVALVIA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION. Z.N.(S.)2332

By Alexander I. Kafanov (*Institute of Marine Biology, Far East Science Centre, Academy of Sciences, Vladivostok, U.S.S.R.*)

Spisula sachalinensis (Schrenk, 1862, Bull. Acad. Imp. Sci. St. Pétersbourg, vol. 4, p. 412) is a name which has firmly entered world literature on Bivalvia for designating a common species of shallow water MACTRIDAE in Far Eastern seas. The geographic range for this species is from South Primorye, Sakhalin, Southern Kurile Islands to Hokkaido and North Honshu, Japan.

2. When handling the collection of Monsieur Barthe taken during the journey of 'La Sybille' and preserved in the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, Prof. Tadashige Habe, 1978, *Venus*, vol. 37, no. 3, p. 124, text-fig. 2, found that *Mactra sybillae* Valenciennes, 1858 (April 19), *C. r. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 46, p. 760; 1858 (April 28), *l'Institut*, vol. 26, p. 143, described four years before, is conspecific with *Mactra sachalinensis* Schrenck, 1862 and should be considered a senior synonym of the latter. An analysis of a figure of one of the syntypes of *Mactra sybillae*, (Habe, l.c., text-fig. 2) taken in Hakodate Bay, Hokkaido, makes us agree fully with this opinion of Prof. Habe.

3. The name *Mactra sybillae* Valenciennes, 1858 has not been used as a senior synonym in the primary zoological literature for more than fifty years and according to Article 23 a–b of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, I request its suppression. The list of references required for *sachalinensis* in accordance with Article 79 b is given at the end of the paper.

4. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not those of the Law of Homonymy, the specific name *sybillae* Valenciennes, as published in the binomen *Mactra sybillae*;
(2) to place the following specific name on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology: *sachalinensis* Schrenck, 1862, as published in the binomen *Mactra sachalinensis;*
(3) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the name *sybillae* Valenciennes, 1858, as suppressed under (1) above.

Prof. Ya. I. Starobogatov (Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R.), with whom I consulted, supports this proposal.

REFERENCES

The following references comply with Article 79b for *Mactra sachalinensis* Schrenk, 1862:

GOLIKOV, A. N. & SCARLATO, O. A. 1967. *Trudy zool. Inst. Acad. Sci.* vol. 42, p. 115, textfig. 95, pl. 12, fig. 2.

HABE, T. 1955. *Publ. Akkeshi mar. Biol. Station*, vol. 4, p. 16, pl. 5, figs 8, 9.

——— 1970. *Common shells of Japan in colour*, p. 158, pl. 59, fig. 19 (Osaka, Hoikusha).

——— & ITO, K. 1965. *Shells of the world in colour*, vol. 1, p. 141, pl. 48, figs 2, 3 (Osaka, Hoikusha).

SCARLATO, O. A. 1955. In *Atlas of invertebrates of the Far Eastern seas of the USSR*, p. 195, pl. 52, fig. 7 (Moscow and Leningrad, Acad. sci.)

——— 1976. In *Fauna and flora of Peter the Great Bay*, p. 103, fig. 243 (Leningrad, Nauka).

——— & IVANOVA, M. B. 1974. *Sbornik rabot Inst. mar Biol. Far East Sci. Centre USSR Acad. Sci.*, vol. 1, p. 311.

YAMAMOTO, G. & HABE, T. 1959. *Bull. mar. biol. Sta. Asamushi*, vol. 9 (3), p. 110, pl. 10, figs 11, 12.

ZHIDKOVA, L. S. 1972. In *Atlas of the Neogene molluscs of Kurile Islands*, p. 139, pl. 27, figs 2, 3 (Moscow, Nauka).

———, KUZINA, I. N., LAUTENSCHLÄGER, F. G. & POPOVA, L. A. 1968. *Atlas of the Upper Miocene and Pliocene molluscs of Sakhalin*, p. 127, pl. 22, fig. 5, pl. 45, fig. 4, pl. 46, fig. 1, pl. 47, fig. 1 (Moscow, Nauka).

CAECILIIDAE IN AMPHIBIA AND INSECTA (PSOCOPTERA): PROPOSALS TO REMOVE THE HOMONYMY. Z.N.(S.)2333

By Thomas E. Moore & Ronald A. Nussbaum (*University of Michigan, Museum of Zoology, Ann Arbor, Michigan U.S.A.*)
& Edward L. Mockford (*Department of Biological Sciences, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

Homonymy exists between names of the family group based on similarity of spelling of the names of type genera, and thus identity of stems, for CAECILIIDAE in current use for a group of psocid insects and a group of apodous amphibians commonly called caecilians. Such cases are to be referred to the Commission (Code Article 55a).

2. *Caecilia* Linnaeus, 1758 (p. 229; as *Coecilia*, p. 196) is the type genus of the family-group taxon CAECILIADAE Gray, 1825 (Amphibia, Gymnophiona). The emended name CAECILIIDAE Garman, 1884 is currently used for 23 genera and about 85 species of caecilians found in the tropics of Mexico, Central America, South America, Africa, the Seychelles Archipelago and India (Taylor, 1968, in a summary of the application of family-group names in the Gymnophiona). *Caecilia tentaculata* Linnaeus, 1758, was the only species included in his family by Gray and was formally subsequently designated as type species of the genus by Dunn, 1942.

3. *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837, is the type genus of the family-group taxon CAECILIINI Kolbe, 1880 (Insecta, Psocoptera), which Kolbe separated from the genus *Peripsocus* Hagen, 1866 in the parallel family-group taxon PERIPSOCINI, while dividing psocids into five such tribes. The emended name CAECILIIDAE is currently used for a group occurring in all continents and including about 16 genera with well over 300 species (Mockford, 1969). Smithers, 1972, and Badonnel, 1951, summarise the application of family-group names in the Psocoptera. Mockford, 1969, p. 78, designated *Caecilius fenestratus* Curtis, 1837 as type species of the genus. The valid name for this species is *Psocus fuscopterus* Latreille, 1799, a distinctive and common European species, and it was wrongly cited as the type species by Smithers, 1972, p. 117. Mockford correctly cited Curtis's species as the nominal type species, but did not correct the synonymy.

4. Enderlein, 1901, raised Kolbe's tribe to subfamily rank (without changing its spelling), included four other genera in the subfamily and separated it from the subfamily MESOPSOCINAE. Two years later (1903) he used CAECILIIDAE Kolbe for the first time. Cockerell, 1929, was the first to recognise the problem of homonymy and proposed a substitute name based on *Peripsocus:* PERIPSOCIDAE. Karny, 1930, maintained that the two genera *Caecilius* and *Peripsocus* must be placed in separate families and proposed the name LACHESILLIDAE for the

family that included *Caecilius*. Pearman, 1936, proposed, as one of nine superfamily names, CAECILIETAE for five families including CAECILIIDAE and POLYPSOCIDAE, assigning *Lachesilla* to another family in a different superfamily. Roesler, 1940, maintained that both *Peripsocus* and *Lachesilla* must fall in family-group taxa separate from the one containing *Caecilius* and proposed including the genera placed in CAECILIIDAE by Pearman (and three other families of Pearman's classification) under the family POLYPSOCIDAE. Mockford, 1978, provided a recent summary of the application of family-group names to CAECILIIDAE and its relatives and discussed difficulties of interpretation and application. Most recent authors dealing with this insect group have ignored the homonymy and have continued to use CAECILIIDAE for this group of psocids.

5. The syntypes of *Psocus fuscopterus* Latreille are two female specimens in the Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles, Brussels. They were recently examined by one of us (E.L.M.) and are clearly the species illustrated by Latreille, 1799, in the coloured pl. 2, fig. 2 and by Curtis, 1837, pl. 648, as both *Psocus fenestratus* and *Caecilius fenestratus*. There is, however, nothing about either specimen to indicate that it is the one shown in Latreille's illustration. The figure is in a supposed life-like position, totally different from the positions of the pinned types. There is reason to believe that these are the specimens from the Paris region examined by Latreille in the Bosc Collection. Horn & Kahle, 1937, and Lameere, 1902, state that Latreille's collection of 'Neuroptera' (Linnean sense, including psocids) went to M. E. de Selys-Longchamps whose collections are at Brussels. These specimens bear a locality label in the elongate style of Bosc's labels, and Enderlein's handwritten label (as judged from the photographs in Horn & Kahle, 1937, the latter probably placed there during his study of the Selys-Longchamps collection at Brussels). Enderlein, 1913, p. 15, referred to two female specimens from Paris as Latreille's types.

6. We have chosen one of these specimens, decidedly more complete than the other, as lectotype. This female retains one forewing (which shows the colour pattern clearly, diagnostic for the species), both hindwings, all legs, a complete head with both antennal bases and the first flagellomere on the right and the first three flagellomeres on the left side. The abdomen, apparently complete, is glued lengthwise along the pin. Measurements of the lectotype are as follows (measuring micrometer unit = 0·014 mm): forewing length 3·06 mm, hindwing length 2·45 mm, hind femoral length 0·67 mm, hind tibial length 1·05 mm. The pin bearing the lectotype has the following labels in the order indicated: first (upper) label, handwritten word 'Paris'; second label, first line handwritten 'Caecilius fuscopterus Latr.', second line handwritten 'Latreill'sche Type' (these two lines in Enderlein's handwriting, referred to above), third line machine printed 'det. Enderlein 1908'; third label, first line handwritten 'Caecilius', second line handwritten 'fuscopterus',

third line printed 'Collection Selys'; fourth label, machine printed word 'type' with border in orange line. The pin bearing the paralectotype has the same set of labels.

7. Dr Tim New (*La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria, Australia 3083*) kindly examined the type specimens of *Caecilius fenestratus* Curtis in the Curtis collection at the National Museum of Victoria, Melbourne. We are grateful to him for the following information:

'There are six specimens of *Caecilius fenestratus* standing under the number 742b (genus no.) and *9c (species no.). The specimens are clearly conspecific: two are directly pinned and four are mounted (with wings and appendages spread) on small rectangular cards. None of the cards and neither pin (the insects are "low-pinned" in accordance with fashion of the time) has any data attached. The specimens are somewhat shrivelled, in common with most dry-mounted psocids, but are clearly recognisable as the species figured in *British Entomology* pl. 648.

'I have no doubt that it is the species now known as *Caecilius fuscopterus* (Latr.) and no other similar species occurs in Britain.

'Although *British Entomology* gives the type locality as Glanvilles Wootton, Dorset (probably Dale specimens), the notebook (photostat enclosed) appears to refer mainly to specimens from other localities. There is one entry "e. June Gl. Woot." but this cannot be linked to any particular specimen. Nevertheless, if the original specimens of *fenestratus* are present, they must be included in this series. In some cases at least, Curtis merely listed additional localities in this notebook, as an adjunct to *British Entomology*. I will label one of the better carded specimens as "lectotype of *Caecilius fenestratus* Curtis, det. T. R. New 1983" in order to provide a definite reference point.'

8. CAECILIIDAE Kolbe must be rejected as a family-group name in insects because it is a junior homonym. There appears to be no valid family-group name available and appropriate for *Caecilius* Curtis and relatives, and no junior synonym or closely related genus on which to base an effective alternative. *Caecilius* Curtis itself includes over 300 species, some of which occur on every continent. CAECILIDAE is not appropriate as an alternative because of the ready confusion and because herpetologists have often referred to their animals both formally and informally as caecilids. In the interests (1) of maintaining as much stability as possible in family names and nomenclatural systems, (2) of enhancing access to the generalisations that they promote, and (3) of having the familial associations of *Caecilius* Curtis and relatives as obvious as possible, we propose emending Kolbe's family-group name for the psocids to CAECILIONIDAE to avoid homonymy. In addition, we request that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature take the following actions:

(1) use its plenary powers to rule that the stem of *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837, for the purposes of Article 29 is CAECILION-;

(2) place the following names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Caecilia* Linnaeus, 1758 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Dunn, 1942, *Caecilia tentaculata* Linnaeus, 1758 (Amphibia Gymnophiona);

(b) *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Mockford, 1969, *Caecilius fenestratus* Curtis, 1837 (Insecta, Psocoptera);

(3) place the following names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *tentaculata* Linnaeus, as published in the binomen *Caecilia tentaculata* (specific name of type species of *Caecilia* Linnaeus, 1758);

(b) *fuscopterus* Latreille, 1799, as published in the binomen *Psocus fuscopterus*) (the valid name at present of the type species of *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837);

(4) place the following names on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:

(a) CAECILIIDAE (emendation of Caeciliadae) Gray, 1825 (type genus *Caecilia* Linnaeus, 1758);

(b) CAECILIONIDAE (emendation, through the ruling under the plenary powers in (1) above, of CAECILIINI Kolbe, 1880), type genus *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837;

(5) to place the family-group name CAECILIINI Kolbe, 1880 (a junior homonym of CAECILIIDAE Gray, 1825) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BADONNEL, A. 1951. Ordre des Psocoptères. In: *Traité de Zoologie* P.-P. Grassé [ed.], Masson et Cie, Paris, vol. 10 fasc. 2, pp. 1301–1340.

COCKERELL, T. D. A. 1929. The Psocid family Caeciliidae. *Entomologist.* vol. 62, p. 19.

CURTIS, J. 1837. *British Entomology;* . . . R. and J. E. Taylor, Printers, London, Hymenoptera Pt. II, Neuroptera, Trichoptera, vol. 4, p. 648.

DUNN, E. R. 1942. The American caecilians. *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool., Harvard,* vol. 91 (No. 6), p. 494.

ENDERLEIN, G. 1901. Neue deutsche und exotische Psociden, sowie Bemerkungen zur Systematik. *Zool. Jahrb. Syst. Geogr. und Biol,* der *Thiere,* vol. 14, Heft 6, p. 538.

——— 1903. Die Copeognathen des Indo-Australischen Faunengebietes. *Ann. Hist. Nat. Mus. Nat. Hungarici,* vol. 1, pp. 179–344, pls. 3–14.

——— 1915. Collections zoologiques du Baron Edm. de Selys-Longchamps, Catalogue Systématique et Descriptif, fasc 3 (2) *Copeognatha* Bruxelles, Hayez, Impr. des Académies, 55 pp., 5 pls.

GARMAN, S. 1884. The North American reptiles and batrachians. *Bull. Essex Inst.,* Salem, Mass., vol. 16, p. 36.

GRAY, J. E. 1825. A synopsis of the genera of reptiles and amphibia, with a description of some new species. *Ann. Philos. London*, (2), vol. 10, p. 217.

HORN, W. & KAHLE, I. 1935–1937. Über entomologische Sammlungen, Entomologen, und Entomo-Museologie. *Entomol. Beihefte aus Berlin-Dahlem*, Bd. 2–4, pp. 1–536.

KARNY, H. H. 1930. Zur Systematik der Orthopteroiden Insekten. Zweiter Teil. *Treubia*, vol. 12. pp. 431–461.

KOLBE, H. 1880. Das Flügelgeäder der Psociden und seine systematische Bedeutung. *Stettiner Entomol. Zeitung*, vol. 41, p. 183.

LAMEERE, A. 1902. Edmond de Selys-Longchamps. *Mém. Soc. Entomol. Belg.*, vol. 9, pp. 1–14.

LATREILLE, P. A. 1799. In: *Illustratio iconographica Insectorum quae in Musaeis Parisiensis observavit et in lecum edidit J. C. Fabricius* ..... A. J. Coquebert de Montbret [ed.], decas 1–111, Tabula 11, p. 10, fig. 2.

LINNAEUS, C. 1758. *Systema Naturae*, 10th Ed., Holmiae, vol. 1, pp. 196, 229.

MOCKFORD, E. L. 1969. The Genus *Caecilius* (Psocoptera: Caeciliidae). Part III. The North American Species of the *alcinus, caligonus*, and *subflavus* groups. *Trans. Amer. entomol. Soc.*, vol. 95, pp. 77–151.

——— 1978. A generic classification of Family Amphipsocidae (Psocoptera; Caecilietae). *Trans. Amer. entomol. Soc.*, vol. 104, pp. 139–143.

PEARMAN, J. V. 1936. The taxonomy of the Psocoptera: preliminary sketch. *Proc. Roy. entomol. Soc. London*, Ser B. vol. 5, p. 60.

ROESLER, R. 1940. Neue und wenig bekannte Copeognathengattungen II. *Zool. Anzeiger, Leipzig*, vol. 130, Nr. 1/2, p. 15.

SMITHERS, C. N. 1972. The classification and phylogeny of the Psocoptera. *Mem. Australian Mus.* vol. 14, pp. 1–349.

TAYLOR, E. H. 1968. *Caecilians of the World.* Univ. Kansas Press, Lawrence. [xiv]+898 pp.

Ancistroceroides Saussure, 1855 (Hymenoptera, Vespoidea, Eumenidae). J. van der Vecht 111
Kassina Girard, 1853 (Amphibia, Anura). A. Dubois & J.–J. Morère and A.F. Stimson & B.T. Clarke 114
Simia fascicularis Raffles, 1821 (Mammalia, Primates). P.H. Napier & C.P. Groves 117
Allygus Fieber, 1872 (Insecta, Homoptera). F. Ossiannilsson . . 119
Mactra sachalinensis Schrenk, 1862 (Mollusca, Bivalvia). A.I. Kafanov. 122
CAECILIIDAE in Amphibia and Insecta (Psocoptera). T.E. Moore, R.A. Nussbaum & E.L. Mockford 124

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

	Page
Officers and Members of the Commission	iii
Members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature	iv
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	67
Special Announcements	68

Comments

Comment on *Chuangia* Walcott, 1911 and *Shantungia* Walcott, 1905 (C. Lochman Balk & C.J. Stubblefield)	70
Comment on *Aphytis mytilaspidis* Le Baron, 1870 (A.D. Austin, B. Bolton, Z. Boucek, N.D.M. Ferguson, M.G. Fitton, L.D. Gauld, T. Huddleston, J.S. Noyes, J. Quinlan & B.R. Subba Rao)	70
Comment on *Kinosternon alamose* & *K. oaxacae* Pritchard, 1979 (The Secretary)	71
Comments on Rasnitsyn's proposal to regulate the names of taxa above the family group (D.J. Brothers)	72
Comments on *Galeopsomyia* Girault, 1916 (L. B. Holthuis; J. LaSalle & P. DeBach)	73

Opinions

Opinion 1246. *Herpetodryas margaritiferus* Schlegel, 1837 (Reptilia, Serpentes)	75
Opinion 1247. *Dactylopius* Costa, (Nov. 1829) and *Pseudococcus* Westwood, 1840 (Insecta, Homoptera)	77
Opinion 1248. *Lethocerus* Mayr, 1853 (Insecta, Hemiptera)	81
Opinion 1249. *Toxostoma crissale* Baird, 1858 (Aves)	83
Opinion 1250. *Gyrohypnus* Samouelle, 1819; *Xantholinus* Dejean, 1821; *Othius* Stephens, 1829 (Insecta, Coleoptera)	85
Opinion 1251. *Dicranodonta* Woods, 1899 (Bivalvia, Cucullaeidae)	88
Opinion 1252. *Sterna cerulea* Bennett, 1840 (Aves)	90
Opinion 1253. *Chromodoris californiensis* Bergh, 10 May 1879 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)	92
Opinion 1254. *Prohysteroceras* Spath, 1921 and *Neokentroceras* Spath, 1921 (Cephalopoda, Ammonoidea)	94
Opinion 1255. *Lespesia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863 (Diptera. Tachinidae)	97

New and revived cases

Larentia capitata Herrich-Schäffer, 1839 and *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). K. Mikkola	102
Mya Rondani, 1850 and *Somomya* Bertoloni, 1861 (Insecta, Diptera). A.C. Pont	106

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset

S 2702

21 October 1983 Volume 40 Part 3
pp. v–vi, 129–190

ISSN 0007-5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

BRITISH MUSEUM
(NATURAL HISTORY)
17 APR 1984
PURCHASED
ZOOLOGY LIBRARY

© International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD

Price £10.00 (All rights reserved).

APR 1980
PURCHASED
OLOGY LIBRARY

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(College Fellow in Life Sciences, School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A. C. T. 2616, Australia).*

Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*

Secretary: Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**

Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 3, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**

Prof. E. BINDER *(Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, CH 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland)* (30 September 1972) **Mollusca**

Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**

Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**

Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**

Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**

Prof. H.E. WELCH *(Department of Zoology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3T 2N2 Canada)* (17 March 1976) **Nematoda**

Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**

Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(College Fellow in Life Sciences, School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(President)* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**

Dr. Curtis W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (29 September 1976) *(Councillor)* **Diptera**

Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia; E D P Methods**

Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**

Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN, *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**

Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**

Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**

Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**

Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN, *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**

Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**

Mr. David HEPPELL *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**

Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**

Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**

Dr. SHUNICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3–23–1. Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**

Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Sir Peter E. Kent, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon, F.R.I.C.
Prof. C.B. Cox
Prof. D. Curry, F.G.S.
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. W.D.L. Ride *(ex officio)*
Sir Eric Smith, F.R.S.
Dr. G.B. White
Prof. J.M. Dodd, F.R.S. *(Observer for the Royal Society)*

B. The Officers of the Trust

Mr. R.V. Melville, M.Sc. *(Scientific Controller)*
Mr. A. Penrose, B.Sc. *(Assistant Zoologist)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 40, part 3 (pp. 129–190) 21 October 1983

NOTICES

(a) *Date of commencement of voting.* In normal circumstances the Commission may start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications in the present part is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretariat of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretariat before the close of the six-month period.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a-b and 79b):

(1) *Astacilla* Cordiner, 1793 (Crustacea, Isopoda): proposed nomenclatural validation by use of plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2319. B. Kensley.

(2) *Hyla femoralis chrysoscelis* Cope, 1880 (Amphibia, Anura): request for designation of a neotype. Z.N.(S.) 2366. H.M. Smith, K.T. Fitzgerald & L.J. Guillette, Jr.

(3) *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816 (Pisces, Siluriformes): proposal to place on the Official List. Z.N.(S.) 2371. R.M. Bailey & D.J. Stewart.

(4) *Neadmete* Habe, 1961 (Gastropoda): proposed designation of a type species under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2420. R.E. Petit.

(5) *Calymene* Brongniart, 1822 *in* Brongniart & Desmarest, 1822 (Trilobita): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 637. H.B. Whittington.

(6) *Panopea* Menard de la Groye, April 1807 (Mollusca, Bivalvia): proposed conservation and related problems. Z.N.(S.) 1049. The Secretary.

(7) *Pachycephalosaurus* Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943 and *Troodon wyomingensis* Gilmore, 1931 (Reptilia, Dinosauria): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2323. D. Baird.

(8) *Donax hanleyanus* Philippi, 1847, proposed conservation and proposed suppression of *Donax hilairea* Guérin, 1832 (Mollusca, Bivalvia). Z.N.(S.) 2152. W. Narchi.

(9) *Dromophis* Peters, 1869 (Reptilia, Serpentes): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2375. D.G. Broadley.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since the publication of vol. 40(2) on 15 July 1983 (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b.):

(1) *Zygaena anthyllidis* Boisduval, 1828 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2442. C.M. Naumann & W.G. Tremewan.

(2) *Massilina jacksonensis* Cushman, 1935 non 1927 (Foraminiferidae): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2443. H.V. Anderson.

(3) *Marenzelleria* Mesnil, 1896 (Polychaeta): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 2444. K. Banse.

(4) *Pellonula bahiensis* Steindachner, 1879 (Pisces): proposal to alter lectotype designation. Z.N.(S.) 2445. P.J.P. Whitehead & G. Nelson.

*(5) *Centrurus limpidus* Karsch, 1879 and *Centruroides ornatus* Pocock, 1902 (Arachnida, Scorpiones): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2446. O.F. Francke.

(6) *Heriaeus* Simon, 1875 (Arachnida, Araneida): proposal to designate a type species. Z.N.(S.) 2447. A. Loerbroks & O. Kraus.

(7) *Leucaspis* Signoret, 1869 (Insecta, Homoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2448. E.M. Danzig & I.M. Kerzhner.

(8) *Remaneica gonzalezi* Seiglie, 1964 as type species of *Septotrochamina* Zheorg, 1979 (Foraminiferida). Z.N.(S.) 2449. A.R. Loeblich, Jr. & H. Tappan.

(9) *Sipunculans* (Sipuncula): proposed conservation of four junior subjective synonyms. Z.N.(S.) 2450. J.I. Saiz Salinas.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

MEMBERSHIP OF THE TRUST

It is with the very greatest regret that we have to report that Dr C.A. Wright died on 19 June, 1983. An obituary is printed in this Bulletin.

The Royal Society was invited to appoint an assessor on the Trust in succession to Dr Wright. We are pleased to announce that Professor J.M. Dodd, F.R.S., has agreed to serve in this capacity. Professor Dodd is also a Patron of the Appeal to fund the work of the International Com-

mission for Zoological Nomenclature. His assistance and guidance will be of great value to the Trust and the Commission.

OBITUARY: DR C.A. WRIGHT

Dr C.A. Wright—'Chris' to all his friends—died on 19 June this year at the age of 54. Words can ill express our griĕf and sense of loss.

His best known scientific work was in the application of experimental techniques, largely of his devising, to the study of molluscs and their parasites, most notably to the snails that transmit schistosomiasis to humans. His synthesis of field work with laboratory studies showed how his intellectual discipline could control a powerful imagination. He also pioneered the Royal Society's study of the undisturbed ecosystems of Aldabra Atoll in the Indian Ocean and served on the committee that planned and supervised the research programme there. These were only two aspects of an intellectual activity of exceptional breadth and vigour. There were few aspects of zoology that he was not competent to discuss; any interlocutor left a dialogue with him renewed in hope and determination.

He was best known to members of the Commission as Secretary-General of IUBS from 1973 to 1976. The changes that he initiated there have been at the root of the present strength of the Union, which he found in a much weakened condition. From 1979 to 1982 he served as an observer on the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature on behalf of the Royal Society and IUBS while those bodies provided subventions to the Trust.

His intellectual brilliance was coupled with strong common sense and a sense of humour. He loved good food and had a thorough knowledge of wine. He was a superb raconteur, so that a meal with him was an unforgettable experience, including the stomach cramps induced by helpless laughter. His zest for life was infectious and gave him the courage to face his fatal illness with undiminished humour. His wife, Pam, to whom he was married for 30 years, was the perfect partner and support for this exceptionally great man.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Since the last list of donors to the Appeal Fund was published in volume 40 part 2 a covenanted donation has been received from Dr E. Trewavas. Donations have also been received from:

Mr David Attenborough; Dennis Curry's Charitable Trust (a third donation); The British Ecological Society; The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Pretoria, South Africa; Professor R.G. Davies; Professor J.I. Furtado; Professor P.C.C.

Garnham; The Linnean Society, New South Wales, Australia; Dr A.J. Sutcliffe (further donation); Dr Angela Taylor; Mr and Mrs Yeats Brown (further donation).

The gross value of the fund now stands at over £72,000 (not counting expenditures).

THE TRUST'S SHERBORN EVENING

On June 30th a Sherborn evening was held in the British Museum (Natural History) by kind permission of the Director, on the 122nd anniversary of the birth of C.D. Sherborn. The occasion was a very happy one giving a pleasant opportunity for members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature and Patrons of the Appeal to meet the Under Secretary for Science, Technology and Environmental matters, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Mr. James Adams, and several members of the London Diplomatic Science Club, including Scientific Counsellors from Australia, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, South Africa and Sweden. The Science Adviser to the Commonwealth Secretariat (Professor J.I. Furtado) and Dr B.J. Lavercombe (Science & Technology Group, British Council) were also present. At the same time the celebration provided the chance for thanking personally those who had contributed to the Appeal.

The Museum conversazione room was amazingly transformed with a fascinating exhibition of Sherborniana kindly provided by Mr Banks, Archivist, Natural History Museum and Mr Ottewill of the Exhibitions Department, the slip cabinet being the very one which was used by Sherborn in the Museum.

Sir Peter Kent (Chairman of the Trust) welcomed the guests. Professor Southwood then gave a highly entertaining talk on the work of the Commission. (This is printed in this issue of the Bulletin). Professor Southwood's talk was followed by an address on international aspects of the work of the Commission by Mr James Adams.

Special mention must be made of the interesting and amusing extracts from 'Squire' (C.D. Sherborn) which were read beautifully by Mr David Wilson (Manager, Teletext B.B.C.) and which added much pleasure to the evening. A musical interlude, given by the Rodney Williams Singers was interspersed among the readings. The songs chosen were of a zoological nature and contributed to the evening's merriment.

Thanks were expressed by the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook, the President of the Trust's Appeal, to the speakers, donors and singers. A convivial buffet supper closed the evening.

The occasion generated not only helpful publicity in the Times and the B.B.C. Natural History Unit, Bristol, but also resulted in additional welcome donations.

This unique celebration for the work of Sherborn, his contribution to zoology and palaeontology, and to the practice of zoological nomenclature in particular, could not have taken place but for all the expenses being met by the most generous donations from members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, the Committee of Patrons of the Appeal, members of the Secretariat of the Commission and other kind friends.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
September 1983

ADDRESS BY PROFESSOR T.R.E. SOUTHWOOD, F.R.S. (Vice-President of the Royal Society) on the occasion of the 'Sherborn Evening' held by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature on 30 June 1983

[In the spring of 1982 the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature launched an international appeal for funds to enable it to continue funding the work of the Commission. One year later the Trust decided that it would be appropriate to hold a reception to thank those who had subscribed to the appeal or who had helped it in various ways. The anniversary of the birth of C.D. Sherborn seemed an appropriate date for this reception. Professor T.R.E. Southwood, FRS, Vice-President of the Royal Society, Chairman of the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) and Linacre Professor of Zoology in the University of Oxford, gave the following address].

It is recorded in the Book of Genesis, Chapter 11, that the descendants of the children of Noah after the Flood, speaking all in one language, decided to build a tower that would reach Heaven; and that the Lord God, to reprove their pride, scattered them to the ends of the earth and caused them to speak many languages. Science, being international, labours constantly to propitiate that sin of pride by constructing a single international language for each discipline.

The early works on Natural History were written in Latin, yet by the mid-sixteenth century Conrad Gesner in the *Icones* that accompanied his *Historiae Animalium* (1551–1558) thought it wise to give the names of animals in Latin, Italian, French and German whenever possible.

He did not recognize what is now clear to us that he and many of his successors dealt not in names but in descriptions of animals. As knowledge developed, and as the voyages of exploration brought home vast harvests of unknown creatures, descriptions, however condensed, were seen to be an intolerably cumbersome medium for the communi-

cation of ideas and especially for comparing one author's ideas with those of others.

Our modern system of naming animals and plants derives from the discovery by the great Swedish naturalist Linnaeus that the function of a name is not to express a description but simply to convey an idea. The taxonomic entities of the genus and the species within the genus having been invented long before, clearly one word would suffice to label each idea. From this came our binominal nomenclature. Latin and Greek then provided the basis for a universal language that might have repaired the sin of Babel, but this was not to be.

Nature herself provided enough complexities to puzzle zoologists. For instance, the largest known Old World species of a genus might have been known as '*maximus*' following a tradition dating back to Aristotle or Pliny. Explorers of the New World might bring back yet larger species of the same genus. A species named '*primitivus*' in the belief that it represented the prototype of a particular structure might be found, with the development of evolutionary theory and fossil evidence, to display a degenerate state of that structure. Such examples merely illustrate the weakness of using a name as a shorthand description.

A less obvious but more serious difficulty may arise from the complex life cycles of animals in certain groups. Linnaeus and many of his successors did not always realize the relationships between the larval and adult stages of a single species, so that different names were given to different forms of what we now know to be one animal. Zoologists compounded such problems by failures of communication between one another. Thus a given genus or species might be given two, three, even ten diffferent names by different authors working in relative ignorance of each other. Some multiple namings reflect nationalist spirit or loyalty to some major author. In this way new Towers of Babel are gratuitously erected.

After a number of false starts, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was set up in 1895 to provide a single international set of rules to regulate the prevailing confusion. The first principle underlying these rules is that of *priority*—the first name to be published for a genus or species is the one that must be used; or the first use of a name determines its use thereafter. However, it is not always easy to determine when a name was first published or by whom. The care that C.D. Sherborn gave to accuracy on these points is one of the outstanding virtues of his *Index Animalium*. In many cases the direct application of the principle of priority produces more confusion than stability. This is especially true with species of high economic or social importance when it is found that the name by which they have long been known is not the first to have been given to them. Yet the presence or absence of their name in a report may influence decisions on the expenditure of vast sums of money by committees of which not one member has any notion of zoology or zoological nomenclature.

Another type of problem—and one that I met early in my own career—arises when what was thought to be a single species—say an agricultural pest—is found to comprise a number of species, not all equally harmful and not all susceptible to the same measures of control. Which of these species must carry the original name? Surely it must be the one that most nearly represents the idea of the original author of the name. But how is this to be ascertained? In such cases the *type principle* embodied in the rules drawn up by the Commission provides an answer. The specimen used by the original author, or one chosen among those that he used, must determine the meaning to be given to the name. In some cases this may mean that the important pest species is not that represented by the original specimen ('holotype') or by that selected from the original series ('lectotype').

Clearly a system of rules, though necessary, is not a sufficient answer to the problems encountered by zoologists. Some organisation must be empowered to deliver decisions that are accepted by zoologists because they secure stability in the usage of names, even if the rules have to be suspended for that purpose. Such a body must have international standing, must embrace all fields of zoology and palaeontology, and must work according to known and accepted procedures. Particulars of problems submitted to it must be published, as must its eventual rulings on those problems. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is such a body. Zoology affects human life at almost every conceivable point: pests attack the animals and plants that provide our food or the raw materials of our clothing; other animals may be used to control those pests if they are in turn protected. Wild life must be conserved or the consequences of its destruction understood. Fossil fuels and groundwater can be found only by careful palaeontological studies. In these and many other fields, including notably tropical medicine and hygiene, the scientific names of animals are a vital element in communication and hence in decisions of courses of action.

The Commission and its publications provide the rules, the framework. I assure you taxonomists are not dull people—they are almost more varied than their subjects—and one rule now abandoned formerly caused much merriment. It laid down that no name that is obscene or likely to give offence should be used. One entomologist working in the Pacific sent in descriptions of new species of insect with unusual specific names like 'Kissme fetu'. Perhaps this was a place name in Samoa? But as others followed—'Kissmesala', 'Kissmefili'—the editor realised to his horror that Fetu, Sala, Fili and others were successive Polynesian girl friends. The editor declined—as the rules allowed—to publish further names in this style—perhaps he was fearful of the combination in the next stage!

Less successful was the editor who tried to prevent the publication of a series of names for fleas and other parasites that were those of ancient Greek prostitutes. The eminent lady who was the author of

these names said it was all in the editor's mind—the names were those of ancient poets, etc., though these persons bearing the same names were much more obscure than the ladies of ill repute.

Regrettably perhaps these problems no longer come to the Commission itself—its work is less amusing, but much more vital.

It seems strange to me that the international community can spend millions of pounds to launch satellites whereby to talk together, and tens of thousands of pounds on biological programmes that may be frustrated by simple mistakes in taxonomy or nomenclature, and yet the Commission—modest, efficient and self-effacing—is left in need of relatively tiny sums. The Commission has an international responsibility; its scope and authority are international; it must have international support. Without it, communications in this vast area of international science will revert to Babel.

We hope that the scientific counsellors here tonight will pass this message back to the governments and academies of science, with two objectives in view:

— first, that their governments may provide direct support to the Commission:

— secondly, that their national delegations may bring pressure to bear on the International Union of Biological Sciences to secure funding from the United National family of organisations, among whom FAO, WHO and UNEF are direct customers of the Commission's service.

FINANCIAL REPORT FOR 1982

In 1982, income from the sale of publications was £15,179, an increase of £1,921 compared with the audited figure for 1981 (£13,258). A determined effort was made to collect unpaid subscriptions for copies of the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature which explains the difference between the unaudited (£6,336) and audited returns (£13,180) for 1981. The last grant of $10,000 was received from IUBS. Other donations in response to the Appeal and Bank Interest brought in £16,317. Total income was £31,496 (£27,294). Salaries and office expenses increased from £14,027 to £17,186, largely because Mr Penrose was employed for three months to assist Mr Melville. Office expenses increased as a result of the Appeal and bad debts written off amounted to £337. The surplus for the year was £14,310 (£13,267). Revenue reserves increased to £56,703 (£38,034). Some £18,359 of reserves have been set aside for the publication of the 3rd Edition of the Code. This includes a repayable interest-free loan of £2,000.

Thanks to money brought in by the Appeal and to assistance from the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux which has undertaken to publish, promote and distribute the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature for the next two years, the finances of the Trust are more satisfactory than they have been for several years. (Note that under this arrangement CAB retain any profits on the Bulletin but pay the Trust two sums of £10,000.)

Despite improvements in finance, there is no room for complacency. The Trust is still unable to pay realistic rates to its employees or for its accommodation. It is unlikely that this situation can continue indefinitely. The Appeal for funds from home and abroad must continue, and on its success depends the survival of the Trust and the Commission.

F. G. W. JONES
Managing Director and Secretary
21st June, 1983. *International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature*

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31st DECEMBER, 1982

1981				
		FIXED ASSETS		
		OFFICE EQUIPMENT at cost	800	
		Less: Accumulated Depreciation	565	
	262			235
		CURRENT ASSETS		
8,910		Amounts due from Sales	3,016	
—		Income and other Taxes Recoverable	824	
33,045		Cash at Bank and in Hand	59,064	
	41,955			62,904
	42,217			63,139
		CURRENT LIABILITIES		
1,701		Sundry Creditors	1,786	
2,477		Subscriptions Received in Advance	—	
3		Income and other Taxes due	—	
2		Bank and Cash adjustment	—	
—		Deposited Covenants Received in Advance	4,650	
	4,183			6,436
	£38,034			£56,703
		ACCUMULATED FUNDS		
		REVENUE RESERVE		
	10,767	Balance at 31st December, 1981		24,034
	13,267	Surplus for 1982		14,310
	24,034			38,344
	14,000	Specific Provision (Note 2)		18,359
	£38,034			£56,703

NOTES:
1. The Stock of Publications has not been valued.
2. The provision for printing of the 3rd Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature is made up as follows:

Specific Donations	9,359
Appropriations from Trust Funds	7,000
Interest free Loan	2,000
	£18,359

P. E. KENT (Signed)
D. CURRY (Signed)
Members of the Management Committee

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31st DECEMBER, 1982

1981				
		SALE OF PUBLICATIONS		
13,180		Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature	14,782	
32		International Code	7	
44		Official Lists	93	
2		Opinions	297	
	13,258			15,179
	12,137	DONATIONS		3,791
	—	APPEAL FUND		5,168
	20	DEEDS OF COVENANT		2,406
	1,879	BANK INTEREST		4,952
	27,294			31,496
		Less: SALARIES AND N.I. CONTRIBUTIONS	8,610	
6,968		OFFICE EXPENSES	2,558	
1,704		AUDIT FEE	125	
125		PROVISION FOR BAD DEBTS	337	
—		PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLICATIONS	5,530	
5,201		DEPRECIATION OF OFFICE EQUIPMENT	26	
29				
	14,027			17,186
	£13,267	SURPLUS FOR THE YEAR carried to BALANCE SHEET		£14,310

REPORT OF THE AUDITORS

In our opinion the Accounts of the Trust which have been prepared under the historical cost convention give a true and fair view of the state of affairs at 31st December, 1982 and of the operating Surplus for the year ended on that date and comply with the Companies Acts 1948 to 1980.

3, Great James Street,
Bedford Row,
London WC1N 3DH.

6th June, 1983

MORLEY, GRAYRIGGE & CO.
Chartered Accountants

NOMENCLATURE OF ORGANISMS CONSIDERED BY SOME TO BE ANIMALS AND BY OTHERS TO BE PLANTS OR BACTERIA. Z.N.(G.)193

The following report, presented by Dr W. D. L. Ride to the XXI General Assembly of IUBS at Ottawa in 1982, outlines the nomenclatural problems that arise in the study of organisms that may be treated as both plants and animals. It was published in *Biology International* No. 6, pp. 15–16 (December 1982) and is here reprinted by kind permission of the Executive Secretary of IUBS. R.V.M.

Nomenclature of Organisms Treated both as Plants and Animals.
Chairman: Professor W. D. L. Ride (*Canberra College of Advanced Education, School of Applied Science, P.O.B.1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616 Australia*)

A number of species of unicellular eukaryotic organisms are treated in both botanical and zoological nomenclature. Because the rules governing nomenclature in botany and zoology are different, such organisms may be known by different names in the literature, concurrently.

In recent years, particularly in botany, a solution has been attempted to deal with the problem, for names at any rate, by conserving individual names acceptable in zoology under the botanical Code (see Silva, 1980, *Taxon*, vol. 29, pp. 121–143).

The International Code of Botanical Nomenclature also progresses towards meeting the problem by giving names of algae, first established as those of animals, priority from the date that they are established under the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (Bot. Code Art. 45.4). This concession does not apply to myxomycetes, also sometimes treated as animals. The Third Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature will require that for a name of an organism, first classified as a plant, to be acceptable under the zoological Code it must be validly published under the botanical Code as well.

Despite these concessions, there are fundamental differences in the operation of the Codes that make the treatment of names different under the two Codes depending on which Code is used by the worker to determine the 'right name' for a taxon. For instance, the concept in zoology that names are coordinated within each of the family group, genus group, and species groups (i.e., that a name established at any rank in one of the groups is simultaneously established at all other ranks in that group), as compared with the rule in botany that names at any rank compete for priority only with names established at that rank (including names established as autonyms), results in a fundamentally different approach to the Principle of Priority in the two Codes. Similarly, the concept in botany that different combinations formed by several generic names and the same specific name are different names, while in zoology

when such combinations involve the allocation of the same specific epithet to different genera they are regarded only as different combinations, not different names, produces a different approach to the Principle of Homonymy.

Different approaches to the substitution of preoccupied names, and to the correction of incorrect spellings, also result in names being correct under one Code and not the other (see examples in Silva, *op. cit.*).

Different starting points in the two Codes (1 May 1753 in botany, for relevant organisms; 1 January 1758 in zoology) and the fact that a name may be invalid (=incorrect, botany) because preoccupied under one Code and not under the other, results in different usages (also see examples in Silva, *op. cit.*).

Possible solutions

1. Ecumenical approach: A possible (but probably utopian) solution would be to unify the Codes. However, the differences are so fundamental and have been established for so long that the change would result in a considerable number of name changes in both kingdoms. For instance, Brummitt and Greuter have independently estimated that some 15–20% of the names given to infraspecific taxa of Spermatophyta would have to be changed if the botanical Code adopted the coordinate concept of the zoological Code (Greuter and Voss, 1982, *Englera,* vol. 2, pp. 23, 4). However, it is likely that some changes could be made to the Codes that, while producing little effect on the question of the correctness of names under the two Codes, might make things a little easier for those who have to use the products of the two Codes such as biologists working in fields such as ecology and biological survey, and for the editors of their writings, who are faced by different conventions in the citation of authorship and the use of parentheses.

2. Case-by-case approach: Silva (*op. cit.*) has demonstrated the use of this approach to names at the generic level. Until a detailed study of the problem reveals the number of names requiring treatment to achieve uniformity, it is not possible to decide whether the approach is feasible. It is clear that the decision by the International Botanical Congress (Sydney, 1982) to admit the conservation of specific names in botany (although limited to species of major economic importance) will enable a greater uniformity to be achieved piecemeal than has been possible hitherto. However, for anything effective to be achieved by such a procedure, coordinated action would be required under both Codes.

3. Separate Code: A solution might be to follow the lead of the bacteriologists and to establish a new and separate Code for all protists that would be more suited to the solution of nomenclatural problems in microscopic organisms and to achieve stability and uniformity in their names. Both Codes are currently more suited to the treatment (especially in requirements for typification) of macroscopic organisms and those

that can be identified by gross morphological criteria; but in recent years the responsible organizations have discussed amendments to make both more suited to the needs of microbiologists (see *Taxon*, vol. 28, p. 428; vol. 30, pp. 102, 3; *Englera*, vol. 2, pp. 34–40; *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 34, pp. 173, vol. 35, pp. 200–208, vol. 36, pp. 17–21, vol. 37, pp. 199, 212). Even if a separate Code is considered undesirable, it is clear from these discussions that a joint approach to the problems of description and typification of protists would be desirable.

4. Arbitrary allocation: Jeffrey (1982, *Kew Bull.*, vol. 37, pp. 403–416—in press) has proposed that the problem might be met by the arbitrary allocation to the different Codes of those taxa of Protista that are customarily the primary concern of botanists (as 'Divisions') or of zoologists (as 'Phyla'). In this proposition, the following Phyla would be the responsibility of the zoological Code, the remainder would come under the botanical Code:

Phylum Ciliophora
Opalinida
Cnidosporidia
Apicomplexa (Sporozoa)
Caryoblastea
Rhizopodata
Foraminifera
Radiolariata (Acantharia, Polycystia, Phaedoria)
Heliozoata
Porifera

The feasibility and attractiveness of this proposition would depend, to a great extent, upon the way in which workers are distributed among the taxa. If most workers on Protista confine themselves to one or other of these arbitrary groupings, the proposition would solve the problem; but if many would have to use two Codes, it is unlikely that the benefit would be sufficient to make the proposition worth while.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Executive Committee of IUBS should refer the alternatives considered in this paper to the IUBS Sections on Zoological Nomenclature and Plant Taxonomy with a request that the Sections establish a joint committee to study them with a view to making recommendations to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature of the International Botanical Congress.

Acknowledgement

This minute was prepared following discussions with R. K. Brummitt, C. Jeffrey, Hj. Eichler, R. V. Melville, D. H. Nicolson and C. W. Sabrosky.

It is presented with the concurrence of N. Grobbelaar.

Ref. IUBS General Assembly Resolution 8 (Helsinki): Names of organisms common to botanical and zoological nomenclature.

The presentation of this report led to the following resolution being adopted by the Ottawa General Assembly:

RESOLUTION 5: COMMON APPROACHES TO BIOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

CONVINCED of the need to achieve greater harmony in the codes governing different systems of biological nomenclature,

CONSIDERING the recommendations following from the Resolution of the XX General Assembly on the Names of Organisms common to Botanical and Zoological Nomenclature,

RECEIVING a Resolution of the International Congress of Systematic Bacteriology seeking an integrated approach to common problems of nomenclature among Botanists, Bacteriologists, Virologists and Zoologists,

RESOLVES to request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Commission on the Nomenclature of Plants to establish a joint committee to examine alternative solutions to achieving a universal system of names for protists, and to invite organizations responsible for nomenclature of bacteria and viruses to participate.

The Secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, with the agreement of Professor Edward Voss, Secretary of the General Committee on Botanical Nomenclature, established a Committee on the Nomenclature of Protists with the following membership:

Professor John O. Corliss, University of Maryland, for this Commission;

Dr Paul Silva, University of California Berkeley, for the General Committee on Botanical Nomenclature;

Dr Bronislaw Honigberg; University of Massachusetts, for the International Commission on Protozoology;

Dr David Hawksworth, Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, Farnham Royal, U.K., for the International Mycological Association;

Dr L. R. Hill, Central Public Health Laboratories, London, for the International Committee on Systematic Bacteriology;

Dr F. Brown, Animal Virus Research Institute, Pirbright, U.K., for the International Committee on the Taxonomy of Viruses.

The Chairman/Secretary will be Professor John Corliss and most of the work will probably have to be by correspondence. The Committee will report to the XXII General Assembly of IUBS at Budapest in 1985.

R. V. Melville
July, 1983

Another paper that bears on this subject has recently been published. The following extract from 'Consequences of Creating new Kingdoms of Animals' by John O. Corliss, *Bioscience*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 314–318, copyright © 1983 by the American Institute of Biological Sciences, is reprinted by permission of the Institute, to which acknowledgements are due.

RESOLUTION OF CODE-RELATED NOMENCLATURAL PROBLEMS

There are a number of possible options available to solve the obvious taxonomic-nomenclatural problems arising from any new multi-kingdom arrangement of the biotic world (specifically, expansion from two to three or more kingdoms within the superkingdom Eukaryota). I am indebted to Ride (1982) for his mention of four possible solutions or approaches listed in a brief report (on nomenclature of organisms treated as both plants and animals) delivered in August 1982 before the 21st General Assembly of the International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS). But, in the critical discussion below, I have modified Ride's points somewhat to accord with my own views on the subject.

A Single Unified Code

This has been called the 'ecumenical approach'. Cavalier-Smith (1978) urged its production several years ago. But the unlikelihood of its success stems from the large number of major and minor changes that would have to be effected in the present international codes of botanical and zoological nomenclature alone to bring it into being. Such revisions, especially if retroactive, would obviously wreak havoc on hundreds of past actions taken by taxonomic botanists and zoologists. Nomenclaturists from both groups already experience difficulty enough agreeing among themselves (working within a single code) without being exposed to the challenge of a truly ecumenical approach! Yet, ideally, this proposal probably represents the best solution as a long-term goal. Some biologists are even thinking (perhaps quite naively?) that the single nomenclatural code could embrace the prokaryotes as well (i.e., incorporate provisions suitably substituting for rules comprising the present *International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria*).

New and Separate Codes for Every Eukaryotic Kingdom

For the Protista, this would mean a code tailored to the needs of taxonomists working (mainly) with algae and protozoa, typically unicellular microorganisms whose lower taxa do present problems sometimes poorly resolved by the conventional botanical and zoological rules. Still, many of its provisions would or should be identical to those already present in the two relevant existing codes, which almost brings us back full circle to the preceding proposal. Phycologists who have faithfully followed the botanical code would hardly agree to major changes, and the same could be said of protozoologists trained originally as zoologists and thus nurtured on the zoological code. Furthermore, until protistologists, a hybrid group themselves, can agree on the exact composition and boundaries of their newly revived kingdom, they can hardly decide what groups of species should be transferred from their former nomenclatural jurisdictions to a new code. Nevertheless, this solution may some day be feasible and justifiable. And it has an undeniable 'pioneering' appeal.

Harmonizing Existing Codes on a Case-by-Case Basis

From a pragmatic and short-range approach, at least, this idea has much in its favour. Botanists, at their recent International Botanical Congress held in Sydney, Australia, have already taken some steps in this direction, proposing emendations or modifications in provisions of their code that permit recognition of certain names accepted under the zoological code (see Silva, 1980). To be successful on a large scale, however, as Ride (1982) points out, coordinated action would be required under both codes, returning us nearly to the ecumenical approach discussed under the first proposition. But the proposal should be further pursued by everyone involved, and in a cooperative and constructive way. It is unclear whether the bacterial code is implicated here. I foresee great difficulties, however, in bridging the gap between the great superkingdoms Prokaryota and Eukaryota—nomenclaturally and taxonomically.

Arbitrary Allocation to Existing Codes

Taxa within any newly established eukaryotic kingdom might be allocated to jurisdiction under one or the other of the two existing codes. Both Cavalier-Smith (1981) and Jeffrey (1982) have formally made this proposal. But, to me, this appears to be the weakest of all possible solutions. It flies in the face of now-recognised basic interrelationships among many protist groups, and it is a backward step since, in effect, it contradicts some major classificatory points that various protistologists are trying to make. For example, numerous high-level groups of protists are more closely related to each other than they are to groups within either one of the two kingdoms with which they have been traditionally associated; various algal assemblages are phylogenetically closer

to certain protozoan taxa than they are to other conventional algal groups; and, similarly, some protozoa are more like algae than protozoa in the traditional sense. The same could be said, on a less grand scale, for protist relationships of the so-called lower fungi (the essentially unicellular aquatic forms with flagellated stages in their life cycles).

The whole raison d'être of recognising a kingdom Protista is to unite great masses of taxonomically similar organisms (> 120,000 species) within a single group phylogenetically set apart from plants and animals. Arbitrarily insisting that subgroups of such microorganisms, often formerly called 'phyla' by chance, must be treated as 'minianimals' nomenclaturally (simply because 'phylum' is a zoological term) and subgroups called 'divisions' must ipso facto be considered 'miniplants' (since 'division' is a botanical category), denies completely—and irrationally—taxonomic distinctness of the protists sensu lato as a kingdom in their own right. Furthermore, such a proposal appears to totally ignore the fact that many identical species of unicellular forms are included simultaneously in high-level taxa called divisions by some practising biologists and phyla by others. To me, therefore, this highly arbitrary fourth suggestion, which at best maintains the status quo, is hardly a practicable option.

A soon-to-be-appointed, broadly based committee of the IUBS will be expected to study these problems. It may propose additional solutions beyond the few discussed here. The committee might be well advised to pay particular attention to the third proposition above (modification of the codes on a case-by-case basis) because its application could bring swift relief to students of such a group as the dinoflagellates, long plagued as these researchers have been by the impossible task of complying with provisions of two different codes at the same time. In the long run, however, some compromise along the lines of the first or second proposition will probably have to be reached.

COMPOSITION OF KINGDOM PROTISTA

Consideration of any resolution to the taxonomic-nomenclatural problems that are seldom realised by many zoologists or botanists to even exist requires some appreciation of the overall composition of such a 'new' (unconventional) eukaryotic kingdom as the Protista or the Protoctista, as some prefer.

OPINION 1256
SOREX DSINEZUMI TEMMINCK, 1843 (MAMMALIA, INSECTIVORA): RULED TO BE A CORRECT ORIGINAL SPELLING

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the spelling *dsinezumi* Temminck, as published in the binomen *Sorex dsinezumi*, is the correct original spelling of the name of the species figured by Temminck in 1843 with the names *Sorex kinezumi* and *Sorex kinczumi*.

(2) The specific name *dsinezumi* Temminck, 1843, as published in the binomen *Sorex dsinezumi* (deemed to be a correct original spelling through the ruling under the plenary powers in (1) above) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2865.

(3) The names *kinezumi* Temminck, 1843 and *kinczumi* Temminck, 1843, as published in binominal combinations with the generic name *Sorex* (deemed to be incorrect original spellings through the ruling under the plenary powers in (1) above) are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers 1122 and 1123 respectively.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2224

An application for the conservation of the name *Sorex dzinezumi* Temminck, 1844, and to rule it a correct original spelling dating from 1843 was first received from Dr G. B. Corbet (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) on 18 May 1977. It was sent to the printer on 16 February 1978 and published on 31 October 1978 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, pp. 125–126. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and two mammalogical serials. No comments were received, but Dr Corbet wrote to point out that the specific name *dsinezumi* had been consistently mis-spelled *'dzinezumi'* in the application. Attention was drawn to this point in the voting paper.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)23 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 35, p. 126. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Savage, Uéno, Willink,

Sabrosky, Corliss, Halvorsen, Schuster, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Cogger, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes—none (0).

Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Binder and Lehtinen.

Dupuis observed: 'Ce cas est identique au cas 635 (Opinion 1261); c'est celui d'une graphie prioritaire erronée qu'il faut corriger (et qu'il faudrait pouvoir corriger automatiquement).'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

dsinezumi, Sorex, Temminck, 1844, *Aperçu gén. spéc. mamm. Japon,* part 2, p. 26

kinczumi, Sorex, Temminck, 1843, *Aperçcu gén. spéc. mamm. Japon.* part 1, pl. 4, figs c, c

kinezumi, Sorex, Temminck, 1843, *Aperçu, gén. spéc. mamm. Japon,* part 1, pl. 5, fig. 3.

(Temminck's work formed part of Siebold, 1833–1850, *Fauna Japonica.*)

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)23 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1256.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
19 April 1983

OPINION 1257
TIPULA FERRUGINEA FABRICIUS, 1805 (INSECTA, DIPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *ferruginea* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Tipula ferruginea,* and all uses of that name prior to the publication of *Tipula ferruginea* Fabricius, 1805, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *ferruginea* Fabricius, 1805, as published in the binomen *Tipula ferruginea,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2866.

(3) The specific name *ferruginea* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Tipula ferruginea,* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1124.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2255

An application for the conservation of the junior primary homonym *Tipula ferruginea* Fabricius, 1805 was first received from Professor George W. Byers (*Department of Entomology, University of Kansas*) on 19 March 1978. It was sent to the printer on 23 March 1979 and published on 1 July 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, pp. 40–41. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and seven entomological serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)31 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, p. 41. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Savage, Uéno, Willink, Sabrosky, Schuster, Halvorsen, Corliss, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjápitzin, Hahn, Dupuis, Cocks, Starobogatov, Heppell, Bayer, Ride

Negative Votes—none (0).

Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Binder, Brinck, Cogger and Lehtinen.

Holthuis voted 'for, if to para 4(1) of the application is added "and all uses of this name prior to the publication of *Tipula ferruginea*

Fabricius, 1805". The suppression of *T. ferruginea* Scopoli 1763 alone for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy would make *Tipula ferruginea* Villers, 1789 a senior primary homonym of *Tipula ferruginea* Fabricius, 1805.' This comment was taken into account in drafting the present ruling.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

ferruginea, Tipula, Scopoli, 1763, *Entomol. carniolica,* p. 321

ferruginea, Tipula Fabricius, 1805, *Syst. antliat.,* p. 28.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)31 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1257.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
19 April 1983

OPINION 1258
OCHTHERA EXSCULPTA LOEW, 1862 (INSECTA, DIPTERA): PLACED ON OFFICIAL LIST

RULING:—(1) The neotype designated for *Ochthera exsculpta* Loew, 1862 by Clausen, 1977, is hereby suppressed.

(2) The specific name *exsculpta* Loew, 1862, as published in the binomen *Ochthera exsculpta,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2867 and with an endorsement that the name is to be interpreted by reference to the holotype of the species.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2256

An application from Dr Philip J. Clausen (*Department of Entomology, Fisheries and Wildlife, University of Minnesota*) for the suppression of the neotype that he had designated for *Ochthera exsculpta* Loew, 1862, was first received on 13 March 1978. It was sent to the printer on 23 March 1979 and published on 1 July 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, pp. 42–43. No use of the plenary powers was entailed. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)32 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, pp. 42–43. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Mroczkowski, Uéno, Willink, Sabrosky, Schuster, Halvorsen, Corliss, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Dupuis, Starobogatov, Bayer, Cogger, Heppell (in part), Ride

Negative Votes—none (0).

Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Binder and Lehtinen.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Dupuis: 'Excellent exemple du danger des néotypes!'

Heppell: 'I do not accept that the cancellation of an invalid neotype designation is grounds for placing on the Official List any name for which no nomenclatural uncertainties have been demonstrated. As the holotype is shown to be extant no action by the Commission is required to prevent taxonomic confusion between *O. exsculpta* and *O.*

loreta. I therefore vote *for* the proposal to suppress the neotype designation but *against* the proposal to place the specific name *exsculpta* on the Official List.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

exsculpta, Ochthera, Loew, 1862, Monographs Diptera North America, part 1, *Smiths. misc. Colls,* vol. 6, p. 160.

The following is the reference to a neotype designation suppressed by the ruling given in the present Opinion: Clausen, P. J., 1977, *Trans. amer. entomol. Soc.*, vol. 103, p. 496.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)32 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1258.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
19 April 1983

OPINION 1259
OGYGIOCARIS ANGELIN, 1854 AND *OGYGITES* TROMELIN & LEBESCONTE, 1876 (TRILOBITA): CONSERVED

RULING:— (1) Under the plenary powers

(a) The generic name *Ogygia* Brongniart, 1817, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(b) all designations of type species hitherto made for the two nominal genera named in column (i) below are hereby set aside and the nominal species named in column (ii) below are designated as their type species:

(i)	(ii)
Ogygiocaris Angelin, 1854 (gender: feminine)	*Trilobus dilatatus* Brünnich, 1781
Ogygites Tromelin & Lebesconte, 1876 (gender: masculine)	*Ogygia desmaresti* Brongniart *in* Brongniart & Desmarest, 1822

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Ogygiocaris* Angelin, 1854 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Trilobus dilatatus* Brünnich, 1781 (Name Number 2198);

(b) *Ogygites* Tromelin & Lebesconte, 1876 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Ogygia desmaresti Brongniart, in* Brongniart & Desmarest, 1822 (Name Number 2199).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *dilatatus* Brünnich, 1781, as published in the binomen *Trilobus dilatatus* (specific name of type species of *Ogygiocaris* Angelin, 1854) (Name Number 2868);

(b) *desmaresti* Brongniart, *in* Brongniart & Desmarest, 1822 as published in the binomen *Ogygia desmaresti* (specific name of type species of *Ogygites* Tromelin & Lebesconte, 1876 (Name Number 2869).

(4) The family-group name OGYGIOCARIDINAE (correction by Jaanusson, 1959, of OGYGIOCARINAE) Raymond, 1913 (type genus *Ogygiocaris* Angelin, 1854) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names with the Name Number 556.

(5) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Ogygia* Brongniart, 1817, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above (Name Number 2135);
(b) *Ogygia* Hübner, [1821], a junior homonym of *Ogygia* Brongniart, 1817 (Name Number 2136).

(6) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
(a) OGYGINAE Raymond, 1913 (invalid because the name of its type genus has been suppressed under the plenary powers) (Name Number 495);
(b) OGYGIOCARINAE Raymond, 1913 (an incorrect original spelling of OGYGIOCARIDINAE) (Name Number 496).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)439

An application for the suppression of the generic name *Ogygia* Brongniart, 1817 (Trilobita) was first prepared by Mr F. Hemming (then Secretary to the Commission) in July 1949 on the mistaken premise that that name threatened the well-known trilobite generic name *Asaphus* Brongniart, 1822, as a senior synonym; and because it threatened the lepidopteran generic name *Ogygia* Hübner, [1821] as a senior homonym. That application, however, was never published in the *Bull. zool. Nom.*

In December 1951 an application dealing with the trilobite aspects of the case was received from Dr Marvin J. Weller (*University of Chicago*) but this too was never published.

In March 1979 I wrote to Sir James Stubblefield FRS (*35 Kent Avenue, Ealing, London W13 8BE*) who had advised Mr Hemming on the case in 1949. The result of this was that an application was prepared by Dr G. Henningsmoen (*Palaeontologisk Museum, University of Oslo*), Dr V. Jaanusson (*Naturhistoriska Riksmuseet, Stockholm*), Dr I. W. B. Nye (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) and Sir James Stubblefield, sent to the printer on 1 August 1979 and published on 18 February 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, pp. 226–230. Dr Nye was responsible for the presentation of the lepidopteran aspects of the case. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and two palaeontological serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)33 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, pp.

229–230. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski (in part), Uéno, Willink, Sabrosky, Schuster, Halvorsen, Corliss, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Savage, Hahn, Cocks, Dupuis, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Ride

Negative Votes — none (0).

Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. No voting papers wee returned by Binder, Cogger and Lehtinen.

Mroczkowski voted 'for, except (5)(b), the proposal to place *Oxygia* Hübner, [1821], *Verz. bekannt. Schmett.*, signature 15, p. 225 as a valid name in the Lepidoptera; and (1)(a), this proposal should be to suppress *Ogygia* Brongniart for the purposes of both priority and homonymy.' Dr Nye pointed out, however, that *Yigoga* Nye, 1975, the replacement name for *Ogygia* Hübner, has come into use in the British, French and Spanish literature and perhaps in other countries as well.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

desmaresti, Ogygia Brongniart in Desmarest & Brongniart, 1822, *Hist. nat. Crust.*, p. 28

dilatatus, Trilobus, Brünnich, 1781, *Nye Samml. k. dansk. Skr.*, vol. 1, p. 393

Ogygia Brongniart, 1817, in Desmarest *Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* (2nd edition), vol. 8, p. 516

Oxygia Hübner, [1821], *Verz. bekannt. Schmett.*, signature 15, p. 225

OGYGINAE Raymond, 1913, *Bull. Victoria Mem. Mus.* No. 1, p. 41

OGYGIOCARIDINAE Raymond, 1913, in Eastman-Zittel, *Textbook of Paleontology,* p. 718.

OGYGIOCARINAE Raymond, 1913, in Eastman-Zittel, *Textbook of Paleontology,* p. 718.

Ogygiocaris Angelin, 1854, *Pälaeont. Scand.*, p. 92

Ogygites Tromelin & Lebesconte, 1876, *C.R. Assoc. fr. Adv. sci.*, for 1875, p. 633.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.T.(82)33 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken,

being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1259.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
21 April 1983

OPINION 1260
ORTHUNGA DOHRN, 1859 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA): ADDED TO OFFICIAL LIST

RULING.—(1) The generic name *Orthunga* Dohrn, 1859 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Emesa wahlbergi* Stål, 1855, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2200.

(2) The specific name *wahlbergi* Stål, 1855, as published in the binomen *Emesa wahlbergi* (specific name of type species of *Orthunga* Dohrn, 1859) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2870.

(3) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Iccius* Dohrn, 1859, rendered invalid in relation to *Orthunga* Dohrn, 1859, by the first-reviser action of Wygodzinsky, 1966 (Name Number 2137);

(b) *Jccius* Dohrn, 1859, rendered an incorrect original spelling by the first-reviser action of Melville, herein (Name Number 2138).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1767

An application to conserve the generic name *Orthunga* Dohrn, 1859 was first received from Dr P. Wygodzinsky (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) on 7 July 1966. It was sent to the printer on 8 November 1966 and published on 6 March 1967 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 24, pp. 39–40. No use of the plenary powers was involved. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 9 January 1969 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1969)7 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 24, p. 40. At the close of the voting period on 9 April 1969 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: China, Holthuis, Lemche, Mayr, Eisenmann, Obruchev, Vokes, Forest, Evans, Jaczewski, Simpson, do Amaral, Uchida, Bonnet, Binder, Mertens, Kraus, Alvarado, Starobogatov, Sabrosky (in part), Tortonese

Negative Votes — none (0).

Melville abstained. Brinck returned a late affirmative vote. No voting papers were returned by Munroe and Ride.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'No action by the Commission is required here since *Orthunga* is the valid name and *Iccius* an objective synonym. But no harm is done by placing these two names on the Official List and Official Index as requested.'

Eisenmann: 'It seems to me that Dohrn, 1859, in his *Emendanda et Corrigenda* might be considered to be the first reviser. In any event, Article 23b also results in preferring *Orthunga.*'

Melville: 'Surely this should be a plenary powers case? If *Iccius* Champion, 1886, is to be rescued, it is not enough to treat *Iccius* Dohrn, 1859, as a nomen oblitum since Article 23b does not apply to homonyms. The voting paper should be withdrawn. New proposals for dealing with *Iccius* Dohrn should be prepared and submitted to Wygodzinsky & Hussey for their approval.'

Simpson: 'On evidence submitted *Orthunga* is valid under the Code. No suspension is needed and no objection arises to placing the name on the Official List.'

Sabrosky: 'Use of the first-reviser rule made it unnecessary to bring *Orthunga* to the Commission. Page precedence (cited in the applicants' paragraph 6) is not binding. However *Iccius* as a properly proposed name has standing under the Code and its suppression for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy will require use of the plenary powers, not mentioned in the application and not supported by evidence.'

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE

After the voting had been completed the file was put on one side while the problems concerning Article 23b and nomina oblita were being resolved. The case was then overlooked. In 1977 I asked Dr I. W. B. Nye to prepare an Opinion. This led to a difference of view between us as to the relative status of *Iccius* and *Orthunga* which was referred to the Council in February 1983. The question then to be decided was whether Dohrn could be considered to have been his own first reviser, even though his *Emendanda et Corrigenda* had been published simultaneously with the rest of the *Catalogus Hemipterorum*, or whether that role could only be filled by a subsequent author (in this case Wygodzinsky, 1966). Council took the view that the latter was the correct position to adopt. I thereupon prepared the present Opinion.

THE STATUS OF *JCCIUS* DOHRN, 1859

In proposing *Orthunga*, Dohrn, 1859, p. 105, said: 'Seite 52 statt *Jccius* Dohrn: *Orthunga* Dohrn.' The status of *Jccius* has never been considered. Clearly it is one of two original spellings, *Iccius* and *Jccius*, and as such is susceptible to first reviser action. I now act as first reviser

and declare that *Iccius* Dohrn, 1859 is the correct original spelling and *Jccius* the incorrect original spelling.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Iccius Dohrn, 1859, *Catalogus Hemipterorum*, p. 52

Jccius Dohrn, 1859, *Catalogus Hemipterorum*, p. 105

Orthunga Dohrn, 1859, *Catalogus Hemipterorum*, p. 105

wahlbergi, Emesa, Stål, 1855, *Ofvers. k. Vetenskaps Akad. Handl.*, vol. 12, p. 45.

The following are the original references to first reviser actions accepted in the present Opinion: for *Orthunga* vis-à-vis *Iccius*, Wygodzinsky, 1966, *Bull. amer. Mus. nat. Hist.*, vol. 133, p. 146; for *Iccius* vis-à-vis *Jccius*, p. 148 herein.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(69)7 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion Number 1260.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
25 April 1983

OPINION 1261
CHUANGIA WALCOTT, 1911, CONSERVED; *SHANTUNGIA* WALCOTT, 1905, ADDED TO OFFICIAL LIST (TRILOBITA)

RULING:—(1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) The generic name *Schantungia* Lorenz, 1906, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(b) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Chuangia* Walcott, 1911, are hereby set aside and *Ptychoparia? batia* Walcott, 1905 is designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Chuangia* Walcott, 1911 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Ptychoparia? batia* Walcott, 1905 (Name Number 2201);

(b) *Shantungia* Walcott, 1905 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Shantungia spinifera* Walcott, 1905 (a correct original spelling by the first reviser action of Lochman Balk & Stubblefield, 1983) (Name Number 2202).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *batia* Walcott, 1905, as published in the binomen *Ptychoparia? batia* (specific name of type species of *Chuangia* Walcott, 1911) (Name Number 2871);

(b) *spinifera* Walcott, 1905, as published in the binomen *Shantungia spinifera* (specific name of type species of *Shantungia* Walcott, 1905) (Name Number 2872).

(4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Schantungia* Lorenz, 1906, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above (Name Number 2139);

(b) *Shangtungia* Walcott, 1905, an incorrect original spelling by virtue of the first reviser action of Lochman Balk & Stubblefield, 1983 (Name Number 2140).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)635

An application concerning the generic names *Chuangia* and *Shantungia* was first received from Dr J. Marvin Weller and Dr Christina Lochman (*University of Chicago*) on 6 December 1951. That application was never published and the case lapsed until Sir James Stubblefield FRS (*35 Kent Avenue, Ealing, London W13 8BE*) revived

it in a letter received on 16 July 1979. This led to a fresh application being prepared by Dr Christina Lochman Balk (now of *Geology Department, Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro, New Mexico 87801*) and Sir James Stubblefield, with which the name of the late Dr Weller was associated. This was sent to the printer on 23 January 1980 and published on 8 May 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 37, pp. 63–64. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and two palaeontological serials.

A comment by Dr W. T. Chang, and Dr P. A. Jell (*Nanjing Institute of Geology and Palaeontology, Chin-Ming-Ssu, Nanjing, China*) added pertinent information not previously brought out. It was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 5. No adverse comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)34 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 37, pp. 63–64, taking note of the additional information in vol. 39, p. 5. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Uéno, Mroczkowski, Willink, Sabrosky (in part), Corliss, Halvorsen, Schuster, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn (in part), Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Cogger, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes — none (0).

Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Binder and Lehtinen.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their votes:

Sabrosky: 'I vote against proposal (4)(b). Walcott, 1913, is not a first reviser. I have carefully examined that publication and the spelling *Shantungia* is used consistently, with no mention of *Shangtungia*. This and other publications certainly indicate that *Shantungia* was the originally intended spelling, but it will have to have been chosen by another reviser, or adopted by the applicants (if no one preceded them), or under plenary powers if Howell & Moore are first revisers for *Shangtungia*.' [This comment was referred to the applicants who promptly prepared a note in which they acted as first revisers strictly in the terms of Article 24a(i) of the Code. This was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, p. 70.]

Hahn: 'I agree to the part dealing with *Chuangia*. In *Shantungia* = *Shangtungia* I see no need for the Commission to act. Walcott,

1911, was the first revising author and with this, according to Article 32b, the spelling is fixed.' [In 1911, *Smiths. misc. Colls.*, vol. 57(4), p. 72, Walcott wrote: '*Shantungia* Walcott, 1905 = *Shantungia* Walcott'. He may have intended to write '*Shangtungia* = *Shantungia*' but he did not do so and his action cannot be counted as that of a first reviser.]

Dupuis: 'Pour les mêmes raisons que dans le cas de *Sorex dsinezumi* (Opinion 1256) je vote pour la proposition dans son ensemble. Je demande, toutefois, que les noms *Schantungia* Lorenz, 1906 et *Shangtungia* Walcott, 1905 soient supprimés à la fois quant à la priorité et quant à l'homonymie. En effet. quelque simpliste et vicieuse que soit la définition de l'homonymie dans le Code, il ne fait aucun doute, conformément à l'idée de Walcott, 1911, que ces noms soient étymologiquement de parfaits homonymes de *Shantungia* Walcott, 1905.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

batia, Ptychoparia? Walcott, 1905, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.*, vol. 29(1415), pp. 75–76

Chuangia Walcott, 1911, *Smiths. misc. Colls.*, vol. 57(4), p. 72

Schantungia Lorenz, 1906, *Z. deutsch. geol. Ges.*, vol. 58(1), p. 79

Shangtungia Walcott, 1905, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.*, vol. 29(1415), p. 87

Shantungia Walcott, 1905, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.*, vol. 29(1415), p. 87

spinifera, Shantungia, Walcott, 1905, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.*, vol. 29(1415) pp. 87–88.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)34 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1261.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 April 1983

ASTACILLA CORDINER, 1793 (CRUSTACEA, ISOPODA): PROPOSED NOMENCLATURAL VALIDATION BY USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS Z.N.(S.)2319

By Brian Kensley (*National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*)

The authorship of the well-known isopod generic name *Astacilla* is usually given as 'Cordiner', with a variety of dates, e.g. 1788, 1793, 1795, which differ because of the difficulty in dating Cordiner's work. Over 30 species have been assigned to this genus. The name has been accepted by such authorities as Sars, 1899; Koehler, 1911; Nordenstam, 1933; Barnard, 1940; Hale, 1946; Menzies & Glynn, 1968; and Naylor, 1972.

2. Cordiner's work carries the date 1788 on the title page and includes a plate (numbered 85 in manuscript in the copy I have examined) dated 1793, and accompanying comments on 'very lively species of little lobsters' which he referred to as 'Astacillae' (signature Ff). The quite accurate figure is undoubtedly of the species known as *Astacilla longicornis* (J. Sowerby, 1805, p. 31), but no specific name was introduced by Cordiner.

3. As the generic name *Astacilla* was published originally as a Latin plural in English text, it does not meet the requirements of Article 11f of the Code, which stipulates that genus-group names must be nouns in the nominative singular or treated as such. Therefore *'Astacillae* Cordiner, 1793' is unavailable and its usage as shown in the first paragraph is illegal.

4. Johnston, 1825, dealing with the same species, instituted the new genus *Leacia* for it and stated unequivocally 'This is a new genus' (p. 220). He proceeded to give a description of a new species, *Leacia lacertosa*, but this is the same as *Oniscus longicornis* J. Sowerby, 1805, p. 31. The name *Leacia* has not been used since and it has been relegated to the synonymy of *Astacilla* by various authors (see Sars, 1899, p. 88; Harger, 1880, p. 363) possibly because of its similarity to *Leachia* Lesueur, 1821, the cephalopod mollusc.

5. Fleming, 1830, discussed the confusion that had already arisen over the name *Astacilla*, quoting from both Johnston's and Sowerby's descriptions, and this constitutes the first available use of the generic name. Fleming, 1830, p. 108, redescribed Sowerby's *Oniscus longicornis* and assigned it, along with *Idotea baffini* Sabine, to the genus *Astacilla*. These are therefore the two species first referred to the genus. Fleming did not designate a type species, and no subsequent designation is known to me. I therefore now designate *Oniscus longicornus* J. Sowerby, 1805, as type species.

6. As more than 30 species have been described under the generic name *Astacilla*, much confusion would result from its replacement by the unused name *Leacia* Johnston, as would be required by strict application of the Code. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that *Astacilla* is the correct original spelling of the name published as 'Astacillae' by Cordiner, 1793;

(2) to place the generic name *Astacilla* Cordiner, 1793 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation herein, *Oniscus longicornis* J. Sowerby, 1805, as nomenclaturally validated by the use of the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *longicornis* J. Sowerby, 1805, as published in the binomen *Oniscus longicornis* (specific name of type species of *Astacilla* Cordiner, 1793) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BARNARD, K. M. 1940. *Ann. South African Mus.* vol. 32, pp. 381–543.

CORDINER, C. 1793. *Remarkable ruins and romantic prospects, of North Britain. With ancient monuments and singular subjects of natural history.* 96 pls with letterpress. London, Mazell.

FLEMING, J. 1830. *Q. J. Sci. Lit. Art.* for 1830, pp. 104–110.

HALE, H. M. 1946. *Rep. B.A.N.Z. Antarctica Res. Exped. 1929–1931*, Ser. B., vol. 5, pp. 163–212.

HARGER, O. 1880. *U.S. Comm. Fish and Fisheries*, part 6, *Rep. Commissioner for 1878*, pp. 297–462.

JOHNSTON, G. 1825. *Edinburgh Philos. J.* vol. 13, pp. 218–222.

KOEHLER, R. 1911. *Bull. Inst. Océanogr.* vol. 214, pp. 1–65.

LESUEUR, C. A. 1821. *J. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, vol. 2, pp. 86–101.

NAYLOR, E. 1972. *Synopsis of the British Fauna*, n.s. vol. 3, pp. 1–86.

NORDENSTAMM, A. 1933. *Further zoological results Swedish Antarctic Exped.* vol. 3 (1), pp. 1–284.

SARS, G. O. 1899. *An Account of the Crustacea of Norway*, part 2, Isopoda. Bergen.

SOWERBY, J. 1805. *The British Miscellany*, part 4. London.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere thanks are due to Drs F. M. Bayer, T. E. Bowman and L. B. Holthuis for their comments and advice in the preparation of this proposal.

HYLA FEMORALIS CHRYSOSCELIS COPE, 1880 (AMPHIBIA, ANURA): REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE. Z.N.(S.)2366

By Hobart M. Smith, Kevin T. Fitzgerald & Louis J. Guillette, Jr.
(*Department of EPO Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, U.S.A.*)

Over the past 44 years extensive research by many observers and experimental biologists has documented the previously unsuspected coexistence in much of the eastern United States of two extremely similar, hence cryptic, species of treefrog, one diploid, the other tetraploid. It has recently been discovered (Fitzgerald, Smith & Guillette, 1981, *J. Herpetol.*, vol. 15, pp. 356–360) that the name that has become universally accepted over the past 20 years for the diploid species, *Hyla chrysoscelis* Cope, 1880 (originally as *Hyla femoralis chrysoscelis, Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* no. 17, p. 29) is based upon a holotype representing the tetraploid species *Hyla versicolor* Le Conte, 1825. It is the purpose of this request to suspend application of the automatic provisions of the Code in relation to the name *chrysoscelis,* since otherwise, under the provisions of the Law of Priority (Art. 23), a different name would have to be used for the diploid species.

2. Only one name junior to *chrysoscelis* Cope, 1880 exists for the diploid species: *Hyla versicolor sandersi* Smith & Brown, 1947 (*Proc. biol. Soc. Washington,* vol. 60, pp. 47–50). Its proper applications to the diploid species is incontrovertible. However, it was used as a valid name only once after 1947 (Schmidt, 1953), hence its resurrection would not be in the interests of nomenclatural stability. To substitute *sandersi* for *chrysoscelis* that has been used consistently, frequently, and in many different fields of endeavour for the past 20 years would be an unnecessary cause of confusion, irritation and regulatory alienation of a large body of professional and amateur zoologists, mostly non-taxonomists, and would have no redeeming features.

3. We estimate, very conservatively, that at least 75 usages of *chrysoscelis* have occurred in different works since 1961, when the name was formally revived in its present sense. No name was adopted by Johnson in 1959 when he revived the species, and although he adopted the name in his doctoral thesis in 1961, as cited by several authors, he did not revive the name in a nomenclaturally valid way until his dissertation abstract appeared later the same year.

4. The name *chrysoscelis* was not used after 1880 until it was revived in 1947 by Smith & Brown for a subspecies of the species (*versicolor*) later found to be the tetraploid member of the diploid-tetraploid complex. Only one other use of the name (Schmidt, 1953) has occurred in that sense.

5. Among the 75 or more usages in different works of *chrysoscelis* for the diploid species are the following 38 that we regard as especially important: Bachman & Bogart, 1975; Becak et al., 1973; Behler & King, 1979; Boernke, 1975; Bogart & Jaslow, 1979; Bogart & Wasserman, 1972; Brown & Brown, 1972; Cash & Bogart, 1978; Conant, 1975; Duellman, 1977; Dunlap, 1963; Fellers, 1979a, b; Fortman, 1974; Fortman & Altig, 1974; Gerhardt, 1974a, b, 1975, 1978; Green, 1980; Jaslow & Vogt, 1977; Johnson, 1961, 1963, 1966; Maxson, Pepper & Maxson, 1977; Mecham, 1965; Pierce, 1975; Pierce & Ralin, 1972; Ralin, 1968, 1976a, b, 1977, 1978; Ralin & Rogers, 1979; Ralin & Selander, 1979; Smith, 1978; Wasserman, 1970; Zweifel, 1970. (These references are held on the file in the Commission's office. Editor).

6. In addition, many state and local lists or reviews, ecological accounts, locality records, range extensions, popular and amateur works have used the name *chrysoscelis* in the same sense during the same period. The total literature is thus extremely diverse in nature, only a small proportion strictly taxonomic, but a large part experimental, anatomical, histological, biochemical, ecological, ethological and, equally importantly, highly popular field guides (e.g. Behler & King, 1979; Conant, 1975; Smith, 1978).

7. The relative brevity (20 years) of the period of universal adoption of the name *chrysoscelis* for the diploid species is offset by the astonishing frequency and diversity of its usage and the use of only that name for the diploid species once it was recognised as distinct from the slow-call, tetraploid species.

8. We therefore propose that the Commission use its plenary powers to set aside Cope's type designation for his subspecies *Hyla femoralis chrysoscelis* (Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia, no. 13762, Dallas, Texas) and to substitute for it the holotype of *Hyla versicolor sandersi* (U.S. Nat. Mus. no. 123978, 8 miles S.W. of Somerset, Atascosa County, Texas). The name *sandersi* would thereby become a junior objective synonym of *chrysoscelis* which would become incontrovertibly valid for the diploid species so long known under that name.

9. We accordingly ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

(1) to use its plenary powers
  (a) to set aside the original designation of type specimen for *Hyla femoralis chrysoscelis* Cope, 1880, and
  (b) having done so, to designate USNM no. 123978 as neotype of that taxon;
(2) to place the species-group name *chrysoscelis* Cope, 1880, as published in the trinomen *Hyla femoralis chrysoscelis*, and as interpreted by reference to the neotype designated under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

BAGRUS BOSC, 1816 (PISCES, SILURIFORMES): PROPOSAL TO PLACE ON THE OFFICIAL LIST. Z.N.(S.)2371

By Reeve M. Bailey (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*) and Donald J. Stewart (*Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

In a study of bagrid catfishes from Lake Tanganyika, we have uncovered a potential nomenclatural problem that stems from the use by Cuvier, 1816 [Nov.], in *Le Règne Animal,* of a French vernacular 'Les Bagres' in lieu of a properly latinised name. Cuvier's text entry 'Les Bagre' (p. 204) is an obvious printing error for 'Les Bagres'. 'Bagres' appears in the table of contents (p. viii) and the text entry in Cuvier, 1829, ed. 2, p. 292, is corrected to Les Bagres. Jayaram, 1956, contended that *Porcus,* attributed by him to Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1818, should replace *Bagrus* Valenciennes, in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1839. We find, however, that *Bagrus* and *Porcus* were both simultaneously proposed in Bosc, 1816 [Sept.]. In order to avoid possible confusion in generic and family names we propose acceptance of *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816, designation of *Silurus bajad* Forsskål, 1775, as its type species, and also request that the name BAGRIDAE be added to the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.

2. Jayaram, 1956, pp. 248–249, correctly pointed out that Oken's 1817 emendation of Cuvier's (1816, p. 204) vernacular 'Les Bagres' to *Bagre* is admissible under the Code. However, Cloquet, 1816, pp. 161–163 [Dec.] had earlier taken the same action. Under the vernacular 'bagre' he referred to Cuvier's recently published genus 'des bagres', described the taxon, and listed and described three species. The first of these was 'Le Bagre', *Bagre pimelodinus,* of which he cited *Silurus bagre,* Linn. and *Pimelodus bagre* Lacep. as synonyms. The description applies to the species currently known as *Bagre bagre* (Linnaeus). The type species is *Silurus bagre* Linnaeus, 1766, by absolute tautonymy. *Bagre* Cloquet, 1816, is a senior synonym of *Bagre* Oken, 1817, *Felichthys* Swainson, 1839, and *Ailurichthys* Baird & Girard, 1854. *Bagre* is in current use for a genus of New World catfishes in the family ARIIDAE (=TACHYSURIDAE of Jayaram, 1956). [Contrary to the indication by Jayaram, 1956, p. 248, *Bagre bagre* (Linnaeus) is not identical with *Silurus marinus* Mitchill=*Bagre marinus* (Mitchill)].

3. Jordan, 1919, p. 194, regarded *Bagre* and *Bagrus* as homonyms, both being forms of Les Bagres Cuvier. We agree with Jayaram, 1956, p. 249, however, that under Article 56a of the Code they are not homonyms.

4. Bleeker, 1862, p. 9 erroneously cited Cuvier as author of *Bagrus,* and listed *Bagrus bajad* Cuv. as type species. Jordan, 1919, p.

194, Jayaram, 1956, p. 249, and others have attributed *Bagrus* to Valenciennes, in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1839, p. 388, who included in it a complex assortment of 58 species now assigned to about 14 genera and three families (Jayaram, 1954). No type species was designated by Valenciennes, but Jordan, 1919, pp. 194–195, listed *Silurus bajad* Forsskål as type by subsequent designation. However, there are several proposals of *Bagrus*, some available, prior to that by Valenciennes.

5. The first use of *Bagrus* known to us was as a *nomen nudum* by Rafinesque, 1815, p. 89 (Neave, 1939). The next appearance of *Bagrus* was by Bosc, 1816 [Sept.] p. 147, who wrote: 'BAGRE, *Bagrus*. Espèce du genre SILURE, que Cuvier regarde comme devant former un sous-genre, à raison de ce qu'elle a deux rangées de dents à la mâchoire supérieure, une intermaxillaire et une vomérienne; son crâne est aussi plus lisse, et sa plaque de la nuque plus petite. (B.)'

6. Except for the entry *Bagrus*, this material is identical with Cuvier, 1816, [Nov.], which Bosc, 1816 [Sept.], preceded; thus, Bosc (and also Cloquet, see below) presumably had access to Cuvier's manuscript or to proof sheets. *Bagrus* Bosc is interpreted as a generic name latinised from bagre. The description is not clearly identifiable, and no available specific name is cited (bagre as used is apparently a vernacular name). It was apparently proposed for one only of the species of the genus *Silurus*. In the absence of any named species we propose that *Silurus bajad* Forsskål be designated as type species of *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816, by subsequent monotypy. No species had previously been placed in *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816, although *B. bajad* and other species have been ascribed to *Bagrus* of later authors.

7. Fleming, 1822, p. 387, employed *Bagrus* instead of 'Les Bagres' for the fifth of the ten subgenera of *Silurus* L. indicated by Cuvier, 1816, pp. 201–207. Fleming included a single species, *Silurus bagre* Linnaeus, 1766. If *Bagrus* Fleming, 1822, is regarded as the proposal of a new name, then *Silurus bagre* Linnaeus, 1766, is the type species by monotypy, *Bagrus* Fleming is an objective junior synonym of *Bagre* Cloquet, 1816, in the ARIIDAE, and a junior homonym of *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816.

8. *Bagrus* was proposed again by Rüppell, 1829, p. 5, also latinised from the French vernacular 'Les Bagres' employed by Cuvier in the two editions of *Le Règne Animal*, as a genus including the Nilotic species *B. bayad* (=*bajad*), equivalent to *Porcus bayad* of Geoffroy. Rüppell also listed *Porcus docmac*=*Silurus docmak* Forsskål, but it is not clear whether or not he regarded this nominal form as a species of *Bagrus*. In the absence of any known previous type designation, we select *Silurus bajad* Forsskål as type species of *Bagrus* Rüppell. *Bagrus*, with attribution to Cuvier, was listed by Bonaparte, 1831, p. 180, without named species or description as a subordinate group (subgenus) of *Pimelodus*, subfamily SILURINI of family SILURIDAE; it is a *nomen nudum*. *Bagrus* was used by Griffith & Smith, 1834, p. 403, as a sub-

genus of *Pimelodus*. The account is a translation from the second edition of Cuvier's *Le Règne Animal*, 1829, with the name *Bagrus* added. One section of *Bagrus* was characterised by eight barbels and an oblong and depressed head; included species were given as: '*Sil. bayad*, Forsk. *Porcus Bayad.*, Geoff., Egypt, Poiss., pl. xv, f. 1 and 2. *Sil. docmac*, Forsk., Geoffr. ib. 3, 4. *Pimelodus aor*, Buchan, XX, 68. In the absence of any known previous type designation, we select *Silurus bajad* Forsskål as type species of *Bagrus* Griffith & Smith.

9. Jayaram, 1956, apparently following Jordan, 1919, p. 107, argued that *Porcus* Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1818, p. 303, is the correct and oldest available name for the genus, usually known as *Bagrus*, that includes the species *bajad* Forsskål and *docmak* Forsskål. Etienne F. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire is clearly the responsible author of *Porcus*, but the determination of the publication date is not straightforward.

10. Sherborn, 1897, attempted to establish dates for the several parts of the Natural History portion of Savigny's *Description de l'Egypte*, published through the period 1809 to 1829. Volume 1, part 1, *Poissons du Nil* by Geoffroy, pp. 1–52, was published in 1809; according to Dr. W. R. Taylor who examined it, there is no mention of *Porcus*. *Suite des Poissons du Nil* (pp. 265–310) and *Poissons de la Mer Rouge* (pp. 311–343) of vol. 2 of the *Hist. Nat. de l'Egypte*, written by Etienne and edited and completed by his son Isidore Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, were published in 1827. On p. 295 Isidore said that the name *Porcus* was first applied by his father '. . . mais que mon père avoit déjà appelé *porcus*'. Thus, *Porcus* should be credited to Etienne. Isidore described *Porcus* on p. 302, with three species. Jordan, 1919, p. 107, gave publication dates 1817, 1818 for the plates of *Suite de l'Histoire des Poissons du Nil*. But examination by us and by Dr Taylor of two copies of this volume reveal names but no date. We are unable to verify Jordan's inference that dated plates existed and therefore assume that Sherborn's date of 1827 applies to both text and plates.

11. The first use of *Porcus* is by Bosc, 1816 [Sept.], p. 332, who wrote: 'BAYAD, *Porcus*. Genre de poisson établi par Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, dans le grand ouvrage de la commission de l'Institut d'Égypte, aux dépens des SILURES de Linnaeus. Il renferme deux especès: les BAYADS FITILE et DOCMAC, qui sont figurés dans cet ouvrage. (B.)' On the same page under BAYATTE Bosc recorded: 'Poisson du genre SILURE, observé dans le Nil par Sonnini, et figuré pl. 27 de son *Voyage en Egypte*. C'est le *silurus bajad* de Forskaël [sic]. Il atteint la grandeur d'un homme, mais sa chair est peu estimée. *V.* PIMELODE et BAYAD. (B.)'. The cross index clearly links the variant spellings BAYAD and BAYATTE. In view of attribution to Geoffroy, listing of included species, descriptive indication, and reference to a published figure we interpret this as an acceptable proposal of the genus *Porcus* E. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, in Bosc, 1816. In the absence of any known type designation we select *Silurus bajad* Forsskål, 1775, as type species.

12. *Porcus* was proposed again in Cloquet, 1816 [Dec.], pp. 52–53, once more being attributed to Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire. The genus was named, described, two species (*Silurus bajad* Forsk., and *S. docmak,* Forsk.) were described, and one is noted as illustrated on plate 15 of *Poissons d'Egypte.* It is apparent that this plate, though presumably not published, had already been engraved and was seen by Cloquet. In the absence of any known type designation we select *Silurus bajad* Forsskål, 1775, as type species of *Porcus* Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, in Cloquet, 1816. Thus, *Porcus* Cloquet, 1816, is a junior homonym and a junior objective synonym of *Porcus* Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, in Bosc, 1816.

13. It follows from the above that *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816, is a senior homonym of *Bagrus* Fleming, 1822, *Bagrus* Rüppell, 1829, *Bagrus* Griffith & Smith, 1834, and *Bagrus* Valenciennes, 1839 (in Cuvier & Valenciennes). *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816, and *Porcus* Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, in Bosc, 1816, both described in the same work, are simultaneous objective synonyms, both having the same type species (see 6 and 11 above). In the interest of stability in nomenclature we as first revisers select the more familiar name *Bagrus* to have priority over *Porcus.*

14. *Bagre* Cloquet, 1816, is the available senior synonym of a genus-group taxon of the ARIIDAE that includes as type species *Silurus bagre* Linnaeus, 1766. *Bagrus* Fleming, 1822, a homonym of *Bagrus* Bosc and a junior synonym of *Bagre* Cloquet, 1816, and *Bagre* Oken, 1817, is referred to the ARIIDAE.

15. BAGRIDAE dates from Bleeker, 1858, p. 49, as cohors Bagrini, and has since been widely used as a subfamily or family name for a group of African and Asiatic freshwater fishes; its included constituents vary greatly. Among its synonyms, the oldest family-group names available appear to be those proposed by Bleeker, 1858 and 1862: BAGRICHTHYIDAE Bleeker, 1858, p. 49 (as subfamily Bagrichthyoidei, based on *Bagrichthys* Bleeker, 1858); CLAROTEIDAE Bleeker, 1862, p. 4 (as stirps CLAROTEINI, based on *Clarotes* Kner, 1855); RITIDAE Bleeker, 1862, p. 8 (as phalanx Ritae, based on *Rita* Bleeker, 1858). Other family-group names and the first uses known to us include: CHRYSICHTHYINAE Regan, 1911; PORCINAE Fowler, 1915; MYSTIDAE Fowler, 1935; AUCHENOGLANIDINAE, BAGROIDINAE, GEPHYROGLANIDINI, and PELTEOBAGRINI Jayaram, 1966.

16. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested to:

(1) place *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816 (gender: masculine), type species by designation herein, *Silurus bajad* Forsskål, 1775, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
(2) place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
(a) *bajad* Forsskål, 1775, as published in the binomen

Silurus bajad (specific name of type species of *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816);

(b) *bagre* Linnaeus, 1766, as published in the binomen *Silurus bagre* (specific name of type species of *Bagre* Cloquet, 1816, of *Bagre* Oken, 1817, and of *Bagrus* Fleming, 1822);

(3) place BAGRIDAE Bleeker, 1858 (as cohors Bagrini), type genus *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816, on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BLEEKER, M. P. 1858. De visschen van den Indischen Archipel. Siluri. *Act. Soc. Sci. Indo-Neerl.* vol. 4, 1858, pp. (2) 370, XII.

——— 1862. *Atlas ichthyologique des Indes Orientales Néerlandaises. Tome II. Siluroïdes, Chacoïdes et Heterobranchoides,* Amsterdam, pp. 1–112.

BONAPARTE, C. L. 1831. Saggio d'una distribuzione metodica degli animali vertebrati a sangue freddo. *G. Arcadico Sci.* Rome, vol. 52, pp. 129–189.

BOSC, L. A. G. 1816 [Sept.]. *In: Nouveau dictionnaire d'histoire naturelle,* etc. Tome III. Paris, 560 pp.

CLOQUET, H. 1816 [Dec.]. *Dictionnaire des sciences naturelles.* vol. 3 (supplement), pp. 160–163; vol. 4 (supplement), pp. 52–53.

CUVIER, G. L. C. 1816 [Nov.]. *Le Règne Animal distribué d'après son organisation.* Tome II. Paris, pp. xviii+532 [This publication is commonly cited as 1817, but we follow Roux, 1976; *J. Soc. Biblphy nat. Hist.* vol. 8(1), p. 31, who determined that it appeared in November 1816, or perhaps earlier.]

——— 1829. Idem, new edition. Tome II. Paris, pp. xv+406.

——— & VALENCIENNES, A. 1839. *Histoire naturelle des poissons,* vol. 14, pp. i–xxii, 1–424.

——— — ——— 1840. Ibid., Vol. 15, xxxi, 1–540 pp.

DEAN, B. 1917. *Bibliography of fishes,* vol. 2. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., New York, 702 pp.

FLEMING, J. 1822. *The philosophy of zoology: or a general view of the structure, functions, and classification of animals,* vol. 2. Archibald Constable & Co., Edinburgh, 618 pp.

FORS[S]KÅL, P. 1775. *Descriptiones Animalium, avium, amphibiorum, piscium, insectorum, vermium, quae in itinere orientali observavit.* Post mortem auctoris edidit Carsten Niebuhr. Hauniae. 1775. 164 pp. 43 pls. map. 4°.

FOWLER, H. W. 1915. Notes on nematognathous fishes. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia,* vol. 67, pp. 203–243.

——— 1935. Scientific results of the Vernay-Lang Kalahari Expedition, March to September, 1930. Freshwater fishes. *Ann. Transvaal Mus.,* vol. 16(2), pp. 251–293, pls. 6–9.

GEOFFROY ST. HILAIRE, E. F. 1809–30. Poissons du Nil, de la mer Rouge et de la Méditerranée (*In: Description de l'Egypte ... Histoire naturelle,* 1809–30). Vol. I, pt. 1, pp. 1–52, 27 pls. Paris, 1809, 4°. Vol. II, pp. 265–343, pls. (completed by Isidore Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire). Paris, 1827, 4°).

GRIFFITH, E. & SMITH, C. H. eds. 1834. *The animal kingdom arranged in conformity with its organization, by Baron Cuvier, with supplementary additions to each order,* vol. 10, Class Pisces, 680 pp.

HAMILTON, F. (formerly Buchanan). 1822. *An account of the fishes found in the river Ganges and its branches.* Edinburgh and London, 405 pp., 39 pls.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE. 1961. International code of zoological nomenclature adopted by the XV International Congress of Zoology, London. pp. xvii+176.

JAYARAM, K. C. 1954. Systematic position of fishes described under *Bagrus* by Valenciennes, 1839. *Rec. Indian Mus.*, vol. 54 (1 & 2), pp. 53–59.

——— 1956. Nomenclatural status of the names *Bagre* Cuvier (Oken), *Bagrus* Valenciennes and *Porcus* Geoffroy St. Hilaire. *Copeia* 1956 (4), pp. 248–249.

——— 1966. Contributions to the study of the fishes of the family Bagridae. 2. A systematic account of the African genera with a new classification of the family. *Bull. Inst. Fond. d'Afrique Noire,* vol. 28, ser. A, no. 3, pp. 1064–1139.

JORDAN, D. S. 1919. The genera of fishes, Part II. *Stanford Univ. Publ. Univ. Ser.*, no. 36, pp. i–ix, 163–284, i–xiii.

OKEN, L. 1817. Cuvier's and Oken's zoologien naben einander gestellt. *Isis, Encyclo. Zeitung,* vol. 8(148), pp. 1179–1185.

REGAN, C. T. 1911. The classification of the Teleostean fishes of the order Ostariophysi. 2. Siluroidea. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (8) vol. 8, pp. 533–577.

RÜPPELL, W. P. E. S. 1829. *Beschreibung und abbildung meherer neuer fische im Nil entdeckt.* Frankfurt a. M. p. 12, 3 pls. [Dean, (1917 p. 369) cited "Abstract in Isis (Oken), 4: 414.", but P. H. Greenwood informs us that this volume of Isis contains no refence to Rüppell, 1829. On page 414 is a discussion of *Gobio uranoscopus.*]

SHERBORN, C. D. 1897. On the dates of the Natural History portion of Savigny's Description de l'Égypte. *Proc. zool. Soc. London,* pp. 285–288.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This application has benefited greatly from the advice and criticism of colleagues who have read preliminary drafts: William A. Gosline, P. Humphry Greenwood, K. C. Jayaram, John B. Kethley, John G. Lundberg, Joseph S. Nelson, and C. Richard Robins. Richard V. Melville has been most patient and constructive in our preparation of this application. Without input from William Ralph Taylor, (*U.S. National Museum of Natural History*), this paper could not have been completed in its present form. He called our attention to several essential references that have been generally overlooked by ichthyologists. We thank all of the above persons, although we accept responsibility for the opinions and interpretations presented.

NEADMETE HABE, 1961 (GASTROPODA): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2420.

By Richard E. Petit (*P.O. Box 30, North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29582, U.S.A.*)

1. Habe (1961a, App. p. 28) proposed the genus *Neadmete*, citing *Neadmete japonica* (Smith, 1879) as type; the diagnosis, discussion and type designations are in Japanese. On page 73, and on plate 36, figure 2 of the main part of the same work, a specimen stated to represent the type species is listed and figured. On the same page and plate (figure 3), and on App. page 29, another species is listed and described: *N. nakayamai* n.sp. The misspellings *Neadomete* (p. 73, caption for figure 3) and *Neadmeti* (App. page 29) are *lapsus calami* and do not enter this discussion.

2. The taxon *Neadmete* was subsequently used by authors who based their use on Habe's identification of the type species. These authors include:

Habe, 1961b, p. 435, pl. 23, fi. 11 and pl. 24, fig. 3.
Kanakoff & McLean, 1966, pp. 1–6, figs. 1, 2.
Mount, 1970, pp. 1–4, fig. 1.
Kuroda & Habe, 1971, p. 312 (Japanese), p. 204 (English), pl. 109, fig. 23.
Keen & Coan, 1974, p. 53.
Abbott, 1974, p. 248.

3. In 1974 it was demonstrated (Petit, 1974, pp. 109–111) that the type species had been misidentified and that the type specimen of *Cancellaria japonica* E. A. Smith, 1879 is badly broken, is probably juvenile, and is not congeneric with the species figured as *Neadmete japonica* by Habe. Smith's type cannot be identified with any known species (Petit, 1974, l.c.). The species that Habe described and figured as *Neadmete japonica* (Smith) has been renamed *Neadmete okutanii* Petit, 1974 (Petit, 1974, l.c.).

4. In 1974 Petit (p. 111) stated that as the type species had been misidentified a petition would be submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to request that the type of *Neadmete* be fixed as *Neadmete okutanii* Petit, 1974, as it is the "nominal species actually involved, which was wrongly named in the type designation" (Article 70a (i)). Although this petition is just now being presented, the following authors have treated *Neadmete* in this sense:

Habe, 1977, p. 82
Hickman, 1980, p. 76
Ladd, 1982, pp. 57–58

5. If the original type designation is allowed to stand, *Neadmete* would be based on an indeterminate species and a new genus would have

to be proposed for those species currently treated in the literature as *Neadmete.*

6. In order to retain the name *Neadmete* in the sense intended by Habe, and conforming to Article 70a (i), I suggest that the nominal species actually designated as the type species, wrongly named by Habe *Neadmete japonica* (Smith), and renamed *Neadmete okutanii* Petit, 1974, be selected as the type species of *Neadmete* Habe, 1961.

7. In order to achieve this the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species made prior to the present Ruling for the genus *Neadmete* Habe, 1961, and, having done so to designate *Neadmete okutanii* Petit, 1974 (= *N.. japonica* 'Smith' Habe, 1961, not *Cancellaria japonica* Smith, 1879) as type species of *Neadmete* Habe, 1961;

(2) to place the generic name *Neadmete* Habe, 1961 (gender: feminine), with type species by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Neadmete okutanii* Petit, 1974, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *okutanii* Petit, 1974, as published in the binomen *Neadmete okutanii* (specific name of type species of *Neadmete* Habe, 1961) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

ABBOTT, R. T. 1974. *American Seashells,* 2nd Ed. New York. 663 pp., 24 pls.

HABE, T. 1961a. *Coloured Illustrations of the Shells of Japan, 2.* Osaka, pp. i–x, 1–183, App. 1–42, 66 pls.

——— 1961b. Description of Four New Cancellariid Species, with a List of the Japanese Species of the Family Cancellariidae. *Venus* vol. 21, pp. 431–441, 23, 24.

——— 1977. *Catalogue of Molluscan Taxa Described by Tadashige Habe During 1939–1975, with Illustrations of Hitherto Unfigured Species.* Tokyo, pp. 1–185, pls. 1–7.

HICKMAN, C. S. 1980. Paleogene Marine gastropods of the Keasey Formation in Oregon. *Bull. Amer. Paleont.* vol. 78(310), pp. 1–112, pls. 1–10.

KANAKOFF, G. P. & MCLEAN, J. H., 1966. Recognition of the cancellariid genus *Neadmete* Habe, 1961, in the West American fauna, with description of a new species from the Lomita Marl of Los Angeles County, California. *Los Angeles County Mus. Contr, Sci.* No. 116, pp. 1–6.

KEEN, A. M. & COAN, E. 1974. *Marine Molluscan Genera of Western North America,* 2nd Ed., Stanford, pp. i–vi, 1–208.

KURODA, T. & HABE, T. 1971. In: *The Sea Shells of Sagami Bay.* Tokyo, pp. 1–741 (Japanese), 1–489 (English), 1–51 (Index), 121 pls.

LADD, H. S., 1982. Cenozoic Fossil Mollusks From Western Pacific Islands; Gastropods (Eulimidae and Volutidae Through Terebridae). *U.S. Geol. Survey Prof. Paper* 1171, pp. 1–100, pls. 1–41.

MOUNT, J. D. 1970. A new species of *Neadmete* (Neogastropoda) from the Pliocene of California. *Los Angeles County Mus. Contr. Sci.* No. 177, pp. 1–4.

PETIT, R. E. 1974. Notes on Japanese Cancellariidae. *Venus* vol. 33(3), pp. 109–115, text-figs. 1–6.

CALYMENE BRONGNIART, 1822, *in* BRONGNIART & DESMAREST, 1822 (TRILOBITA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION. Z.N.(S.)637

By H. B. Whittington (*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge, U.K.*)

Desmarest, 1816, pp. 49–50, described four species of trilobites under the vernacular name Calymène. In 1817, pp. 517–518 (under the entry 'Crustacés') he described them again but gave the vernacular name Calymène its accompanying latinised form *Calymena.* He said: 'Calymène de Blumenbach, ou fossile de Dudley, *Calymena Blumenbachii* Brong. Le fossile appelé par Blumenbach *Entomolithus paradoxus,* bien qu'il soit très-différent de celui de Linnaeus, est le type de ce genre. [description follows]. Il se trouve à Dudley en Angleterre, dans une pierre argileuse grise.'

2. In 1822, p. 11, Brongniart associated the vernacular name Calymène with the latinised form *Calymene* and described *Calymene blumenbachii* in greater detail, with illustrations. He again drew attention to the difference between the species described by Linnaeus as *Entomolithus paradoxus* and by Blumenbach under the same name. The species in question is one of the best known trilobites in the world and is particularly well known in well preserved exoskeletons from the Silurian of Dudley, England. Since 1822 the genus has been universally referred to as *Calymene.* So far as is known, the spelling *Calymena* has been used only once, and then as an invalid synonym, by Whittington, 1959, p. 0.452.

3. Before going any further, it is necessary to establish the status of *Entomolithus paradoxus* Linnaeus and of *Entomolithus paradoxus* Blumenbach. Sherborn, *Index Animalium,* cites the name in quotation marks, and gives a reference to 'Syst. Nat. ed. 12, p. 160, 1768'. If such a name existed it would have no status in nomenclature by virtue of the ruling given in Opinion 296, but in fact no such name exists there. In fact, *Entomolithus paradoxus* was described by Linnaeus in 1759, *K. Vetenskaps Akad. Handl.,* vol. 20, p. 19. The name was suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy in Opinion 496. *Entomolithus paradoxus* Blumenbach, which denotes a different nominal species, is therefore a junior primary homonym and *Calymene blumenbachii* is the oldest nomenclaturally valid binomen for the genus and the species.

4. The vernacular family name Calymenines was proposed by Milne Edwards, 1840, p. 293 and may be corrected under Article 11e (ii) to CALYMENIDAE and attributed to Milne Edwards, 1840. This name has been in common use ever since. The authorship was attributed to Milne Edwards (e.g. Raymond in Zittel, 1913, p. 724; Shirley, 1936, p. 384). However, the first author to use the correct suffix was

Burmeister, 1843, p. 93, and Whittington, 1959, p. 0.450, attributed authorship of the family name to him. Certain subsequent authors (Hass, 1968; Schrank, 1970; Pillet, 1972) have followed this practice, but others (Campbell, 1967; Ingham, 1977) have cited the author as Milne Edwards. The latter is the more desirable course and is in accordance with the Code. The original specimens of *Calymene blumenbachii* are preserved and have been redescribed by Shirley, 1933.

5. The following is a selection of references to the use of *Calymene* in the last 50 years:

Shirley, J. 1933. *Mem. Proc. Manchester lit. phil. Soc.*, vol. 77, pp. 51–67, pl. 1.
——1936. *Q.J. geol. Soc. London*, vol. 92, pp. 384–422, pls 29–31.
Gill, E. D. 1945. *Proc. roy. Soc. Victoria*, n.s. vol. 56, pp. 171–186.
Richter, R. & Richter, E. 1954. *Abh. senck. naturforsch. Ges.*, vol. 488, pp. 1–76, pls 1–6.
Whittington, H. B. 1959. *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*, vol. 0, Arthropoda 1, p. 0.452.
Campbell, K. S. W. 1967. *Bull. Oklahoma geol. Surv.*, vol. 115, pp. 1–68, pls 1–19.
Hass, W. 1968. *Palaeontographica*, vol. A.130, pp. 60–207, pls 26–37.
Schrank, E. 1970. *Ber. deutsch. Ges. geol. Wiss.*, A, Geol.-Paläont., vol. 15, pp. 109–146, pls 1–12.
Whittington, H. B. 1971. *Palaeontology*, vol. 14, pp. 455–477.
Pillet, J. 1972. *Soc. études sci. Anjou*, mém. 1, pp. 1–307.
Ingham, J. K. 1977. Upper Ordovician trilobites from the Cautley and Dent districts of Westmorland and Yorkshire, Part III. *Palaeontogr. Soc.* (Monograph), pp. 89–121, pls 19–27.

6. There appear to be two possible ways in which the name *Calymene* might be conserved. One would be to use the plenary powers to rule that it is a correct original spelling and to date it from Desmarest, 1817. As the name has always been attributed to Brongniart, that would be the less desirable course. The other way would be to suppress *Calymena* Desmarest, 1817 for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, and that is now proposed.

7. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Calymena* Desmarest, 1817, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Calymene* Brongniart, 1822 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Calymena blumenbachii* Brongniart *in* Desmarest, 1817, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *blumenbachii* Brongniart *in* Desmarest, 1817, as published in the binomen

Calymena blumenbachii (specific name of type species of *Calymene* Brongniart, 1822) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the family-group name CALYMENIDAE Milne Edwards, 1840 (type genus *Calymene* Brongniart, 1822) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BRONGNIART, A. & DESMAREST, A. G. 1822. *Histoire naturelle des Crustacés fossiles.* Paris.

BURMEISTER, H. 1843. *Organisation der Trilobiten.* Berlin.

DESMAREST, A. G. 1816. *in Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.*, 2nd ed., vol. 5, pp. 49–50.

——1817, *in Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.*, 2nd ed., vol. 8, pp. 517–518.

MILNE EDWARDS, H. 1840. *Hist. nat. Crustacés* (Roret's Suites à Buffon), vol. 3, p. 293.

WHITTINGTON, H. B. 1959, *in Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*, vol. 0, Arthropoda 1, p. 0. 450–454.

ZITTEL, K. A. VON 1913. *Text-book of Paleontology*, ed. C. R. Eastman. Macmillan, London, pp. x+839.

PANOPEA MENARD DE LA GROYE, APRIL 1807 (MOLLUSCA, BIVALVIA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION AND RELATED PROBLEMS. Z.N.(S.)1049

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Introduction

An application on this subject by Professor H. E. Vokes (*Tulane University, New Orleans, U.S.A.*) and the late Dr L. R. Cox (*British Museum (Natural History), London)* was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 18, pp. 184–188, 1961. For reasons that are now obscure it was never taken to a vote. It is here revived, with certain modifications to the earlier presentation. Dr Holthuis pointed out that Ménard de la Groye's pamphlet *Mémoire sur un nouveau genre de coquille bivalve-équivalve* ... of January 1807 must be treated as having been published for the purposes of the Code, so that in consequence the generic name *Panope* must be suppressed under the plenary powers. Mr Heppell discovered earlier references to the family names PECTUNCULIDAE and GLYCYMERIDIDAE than those provided by the applicants. Dr Robert Robinson and Professor Vokes provided evidence of usage of the three names *Panope, Panopea* and *Panopaea* for the nominal genus centrally involved.

Statement of the Case

The main object of the present application is the stabilization of the form of the generic name that has hitherto been known by the alternative renderings, *Panope, Panopea* and *Panopaea.* The opportunity is taken to seek clarification of the status of certain names involved in the discussion.

2. The taxonomic genus to which the names just mentioned have been applied was originally named *Glycimeris* by Lamarck, 1799, *Mém. Soc. Phys. Hist. nat. Paris,* p. 83, the type species being *Mya glycimeris* Born, 1778, *Index Mus. Caes. Vind.*, p. 10, by monotypy. In 1898 Dall, *Trans. Wagner free Inst. Sci.*, vol. 3, pp. 571–572, 607–613, revived the neglected name *Glycymeris* da Costa, 1778, *Hist. nat. Test. Brit.*, p. 168, for the genus of bivalves that up to then had generally been called *Pectunculus* Lamarck, 1799 (*Mém. Soc. Phys. Hist. nat. Paris,* p. 87), a junior homonym of *Pectunculus* da Costa, 1778. From then on, *Glycimeris* Lamarck, 1799, was rejected as a virtual homonym of *Glycymeris* da Costa, 1778. The 1961 Code, however, Article 56a, ruled that generic names are not homonyms if they differ in spelling by a single letter. There is therefore no need to reject *Glycimeris* Lamarck for homonymy. The coexistence in a single molluscan class of two generic names differ-

ing in only a single letter—a vowel—would be a serious cause of confusion. The Commission is therefore asked to suppress Lamarck's name for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

3. The genus *Glycymeris* da Costa, whose name is now proposed for the Official List, was established with a single included nominal species cited as *Glycymeris orbicularis,* with *Arca glycymeris* Linnaeus in its synonymy. The reference was to the 12th edition of the *Systema Naturae,* but the original reference is 1758, ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 695. Under Article 68d, *Arca glycymeris* Linnaeus, 1758, is therefore the type species by absolute tautonymy.

4. The name of the genus with which this application is principally concerned was first published as *Panope* by Ménard de la Groye in January, 1807, in a pamphlet entitled *Mémoire sur un nouveau genre de coquille bivalve-équivalve, de la famille des Solénoides intermédiaire aux Solens et aux Myas* (etc.). This pamphlet was first noticed by Dall, 1912, *Proc. malac. Soc. London,* vol. 10, p. 34. Apart from Dall's copy, only two others are known: one in the library of the Muséum national d'Histoire Naturelle in Paris, and one that passed through the hands of a Paris bookseller to an unrecorded purchaser in 1954. In their earlier application Vokes & Cox adduced circumstantial evidence to show that this pamphlet, though dated 'Janvier, 1807', may not have been published until after April, 1807, with effects noted in the next paragraph; but Dr Holthuis, in a letter commenting on that application, pointed out that the evidence presented was not sufficient to permit the assumption that the date of publication was incorrectly cited in the work.

4. In April 1807 what appears to be a version of the same pamphlet, shortened from 37 pages to nine, appeared in *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris,* vol. 9, with the name *Panopea* on p. 135. On both occasions the same two species were included in the genus, *P. aldrovandi* Ménard and *P. faujas* (sic) Ménard; of these the first was designated as type species by Children, 1823, *Q. J. Sci.* vol. 14, p. 84; but the generic name was now spelt *Panopaea,* following Lamarck, 1818, *Hist. nat. Anim. sans Vert.,* vol. 5, p. 456.

5. The suppression of *Glycimeris* Lamarck, 1799, was proposed in paragraph 2 above. An additional reason for doing so is that Lamarck did not adhere to his original usage but in 1801, *Syst. Anim. sans Vert.*, p. 126, transferred the name to the genus typified by *Mya siliqua* Spengler, 1793, *Skrivt. naturhist. Selskabet,* vol. 3, p. 48. This name was at one time fairly widely used, but after its status as a junior homonym was recognised it was replaced by *Cyrtodaria.* This name is usually attributed to Daudin, 1799, *Bull. Soc. philomath. Paris,* vol. 22, p. 170, but he gave only the vernacular name 'Cyrtodaire'. He diagnosed the genus and included three species in it under the names used by their original authors. Reuss, 1801, *Repertorium Commentationum,* vol. 1, p. 351, listed the genus under the Latin name *Cyrtodaria* with a refer-

ence to Daudin's work. This serves as an indication for the generic name and establishes Reuss as its author; but under Article 69a (ii) (1) the species mentioned by Daudin cannot be considered as originally included in *Cyrtodaria* Reuss, which was in fact established without originally included species. The first subsequent author to have referred a species to the genus was Gray, 1847, 'A list of the genera of Recent Mollusca, their synonyms and types', *Proc. zool. Soc. London* for 1847, p. 190, where *Mya siliqua* alone was cited, without an author. Vokes & Cox thought that this 'must be ignored', but I take it as an inclusion of *Mya siliqua* Spengler, 1793 in the genus and as the fixation of that species as the type species of *Cyrtodaria* by subsequent monotypy. If my view is not correct, then the first authors to include a species in *Cyrtodaria* are Vokes & Cox, p. 186, when they fixed *Mya siliqua* Spengler, 1793 as type species by subsequent monotypy.

6. Two family-group names are involved in the present application. Mr Heppell has provided earlier references for these than were given by Vokes & Cox. The first of these is GLYCYMERIDAE Newton, 1916, *J. Conch.* vol. 15, p. 83 (type genus *Glycymeris* da Costa, 1778) (correctly GLYCYMERIDIDAE, as shown by Stenzel, Krause & Twining, 1957, *Univ. Texas Publ.* No. 5704, p. 60). GLYCYMERIDAE Herrmannsen, 1846, *Ind. Gen. Malac. Primordia,* p. 482 is derived from 'Les Glycimérides' of Deshayes, 1839, *Traité élémentaire Conchyl.,* vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 124, which is based on *Glycimeris* Lamarck, 1801, *non* 1799 and is invalid as being based on a junior homonym. AXINAEINAE H. & A. Adams, 1858, *Genera Rec. Moll.,* vol. 2, p. 541, is a senior synonym of GLYCYMERIDAE Newton, because its type genus, *Axinaea* Poli, 1791 *Testacea utriusque Siciliae,* vol. 1, Introd., p. 32, (type species, by subsequent designation by Gray, 1847, p. 198, *Arca pilosa* Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 12, vol. 1, p. 1143) is a junior synonym of *Glycymeris* da Costa. The rejection of *Axinaea* as a junior synonym led to the rejection of the family-group name based on it; GLYCYMERIDIDAE Newton is therefore protected under Article 40a. PECTUNCULINAE Dall, 1898, *Trans. Wagner free Inst. Sci.,* vol. 3, p. 607, is also a senior synonym of GLYCYMERIDAE Newton but is invalid because it is based on the junior homonym *Pectunculus* Lamarck, 1799, *non* da Costa, 1778. PECTUNCULIDAE Gray, 1847, *Proc. zool. Soc. London* for 1847, p. 273, based on *Pectunculus* da Costa, 1778, is nomenclaturally valid, but taxonomically unnecessary in the present state of knowledge, because *Pectunculus* da Costa is now treated as a subgenus of *Dosinia* Scopoli, 1777.

7. The second family-group name involved is PANOPEIDAE Stewart, 1930, *Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia, spec. Publ.* No. 3, p. 294, based on *Panopea,* but the genus is most usually referred to the family HIATELLIDAE Winckworth (formerly SAXICAVIDAE Swainson). No action is proposed regarding any of these three names.

8. The original application included proposals that *Axinaea*

Poli, 1791 be placed on the Official List and *Tuceta* Röding, 1798 on the Official Index; but as the first is subjectively invalid (as a junior subjective synonym of *Glycymeris* da Costa, 1778) and the latter is objectively invalid (as a junior objective synonym of *Axinaea*) no action is called for regarding them.

Records of Usage

9. Extensive evidence of usage of the three spellings in question has been provided by Dr Robert Robinson (*Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia*) in 1962 and by Professor Vokes in 1978. Dr Robertson gave evidence for the years 1929–1958 (with a separate figure for the period 1947–1958); Dr Vokes gave evidence for the period 1959–1978 (with separate figures for the periods 1959–1968 and 1969–1978). Dr Vokes's figures are supported by references held on the Commission's file.

	1929–1958	(1947–1958)	1959–1978	(1959–1968)	(1969–1978)
Panope	12	(7)	47	(28)	(35)
Panopea	14	(3)	85	(35)	(50)
Panopaea	11		8		

10. These figures show that *Panopea* has steadily gained ground as the most widely used spelling since 1958, and notably so since 1969, when *Panopea* was used in the *Treatise of Invertebrate Paleontology*, vol. N2, p. N.700. They also show that no action is necessary concerning the youngest spelling, *Panopaea*.

Proposals to the Commission

11. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the following generic names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

(a) *Glycimeris* Lamarck, 1799;
(b) *Panope* Ménard de la Groye, 1807;

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(a) *Cyrtodaria* Reuss, 1801 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent monotypy, *Mya siliqua* Spengler, 1793;
(b) *Glycymeris* da Costa, 1778 (gender: feminine), type species by absolute tautonymy, *Arca glycymeris* Linnaeus, 1758;
(c) *Panopea* Ménard de la Groye, 1807 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by Children, 1823, *Panopea aldrovandi* Ménard de la Groye, 1807;

(d) *Pectunculus* da Costa, 1778 (gender: masculine), type species by subsequent designation by Juke-Browne, 1911, *Proc. malac. Soc. London*, vol. 9, p. 250, *Pectunculus capillaceus* da Costa, 1778, p. 187;

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *siliqua* Spengler, 1793, as published in the binomen *Mya siliqua* (specific name of type species of *Cyrtodaria* Reuss, 1801);
(b) *glycymeris* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Arca glycymeris* (specific name of type species of *Glycymeris* da Costa, 1778);
(c) *aldrovandi* Ménard de la Groye, 1807, as published in the binomen *Panopea aldrovandi* (specific name of type species of *panopea* Ménard de la Groye, 1807);
(d) *exoleta* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.*, ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 688 as published in the binomen *Venus exoleta* (the oldest available name for the type species of *Pectunculus* da Costa, 1788);

(4) to place the family name GLYCYMERIDIDAE Stewart, 1930 (type genus *Glycymeris* da Costa, 1778) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology;

(5) to place the following generic names on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;

(a) *Glycimeris* Lamarck, 1799, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above;
(b) *Glycimeris* Lamarck, 1801, a junior homonym of *Glycimeris* Lamarck, 1799;
(c) *Panope* Ménard de la Groye, 1807, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above;
(d) *Pectunculus* Lamarck, 1799, a junior homonym of *Pectunculus* da Costa, 1778;

(6) to place the following specific names on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *capillaceus* da Costa, 1778, as published in the binomen *Pectunculus capillaceus* (a junior objective synonym of *exoleta* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Venus exoleta*);
(b) *orbicularis* da Costa, 1778, as published in the binomen *Glycymeris orbicularis* (a junior objective synonym of *glycymeris* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Arca glycymeris*).

PACHYCEPHALOSAURUS BROWN & SCHLAIKJER, 1943 AND *TROODON WYOMINGENSIS* GILMORE, 1931 (REPTILIA, DINOSAURIA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION, Z.N.(S.)2323

By Donald Baird (*Museum of Natural History, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, U.S.A.*)

The object of this application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress a name, which, so long as it remains available, represents a potential threat to the stability of the nomenclature of an important group of dinosaurs. The names concerned are *Tylosteus* Leidy, 1872 (*Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, 1872, p. 40) and *ornatus* (ibid.), published in conjunction with the foregoing generic name.

2. In 1872 Joseph Leidy established the new genus and species *Tylosteus ornatus* on the basis of a broken fossil bone that the geological explorer Ferdinand V. Hayden had collected somewhere in the '"Black Foot country" at the head of the Missouri River' in the western territories of the United States. Leidy was able to identify his specimen neither anatomically nor taxonomically, but he thought it might be 'part of the dermal armor of some huge saurian or perhaps of an armadillo-like animal'. The following year Leidy (1873, pp. 285–286, pl. 19, fig. 14) published an illustration and a somewhat amplified description of *Tylosteus ornatus*, stating that the specimen was 'probably derived from the Cretaceous formation' and concluding, by way of identification, that 'it looks as if it might be an element of the osseous dermal armor of some animal, whether reptile or mammal is by no means certain, though ... I suspect the former'. The type specimen was deposited in the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia as ANSP 8568. Thus a taxon was validly published although the anatomical identity, systematic position, geologic age, and geographic source of the type specimen were conjectural or vague.

3. The few authors who have subsequently noticed *Tylosteus ornatus* have done so only to dismiss it. O. P. Hay's catalogue (1902, p. 477) listed it doubtfully among the lizards, adding (perceptively) 'It is not improbably a portion of the dermal armor of some Dinosaur'. C. L. Camp (1923, p. 303) merely cited Hay in dismissing the taxon from consideration as a lizard. S. W. Williston (1925, p. 274) listed *Tylosteus* as a questionable lizard *incertae sedis*, erroneously attributing the name to E. D. Cope. C. W. Gilmore (1928, p. 1)—who seems to have been the only palaeontologist since Leidy to examine the type specimen—dismissed the taxon as one of several 'originally referred to the Lacertilia [but] now known to belong to the Dinosauria'. In the subsequent half-century the name has not even been cited.

4. Upon reexamination (Baird, 1979) the type specimen of *Tylosteus ornatus* proves to be readily identifiable as the nodose

portion of the left squamosal bone from a skull of the dome-headed dinosaur *Pachycephalosaurus* Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943, p. 132 (Ornithischia; Pachycephalosauria; PACHYCEPHALOSAURIDAE). Although several nominal species of that genus have been distinguished on the basis of differences in the nodose excrescences on the squamosal, current authorities agree that these differences are probably attributable to sexual dimorphism and individual variation; indeed, the ornamentation tends to differ on the two sides of a single skull. The type species, *Pachycephalosaurus grangeri* Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943, p. 133, is therefore a junior subjective synonym of *P. wyomingensis* (Gilmore, 1931, pp. 1–4) (described as *Troödon wyomingensis*) (Galton, 1971; Baird, 1979). All the known specimens are derived from the Lance and Hell Creek Formations (formations of equivalent, latest Cretaceous age) in Montana, South Dakota and Wyoming.

5. From examination of historical records I hypothesize that the type specimen of *Tylosteus ornatus* was collected by Hayden on Capt. W. F. Raynolds' expedition of 1859–60, from an outcrop of the Lance Formation that the party crossed on a traverse northwestward from the headwaters of the Little Missouri River in the Black Hills of northwestern South Dakota to Little Powder River in southeastern Montana. This area was 'Blackfoot country', i.e. it lay within the territory of the Blackfoot band of Teton Dakota Indians.

6. In the opinion of all current workers who have examined the evidence, *Tylosteus* Leidy, 1872, is a senior subjective synonym of *Pachycephalosaurus* Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943; and *T. ornatus* Leidy, 1872 is a senior subjective synonym of *P. wyomingensis* (Gilmore, 1931). Strict application of the rule of priority would require that the junior names be supplanted. *Tylosteus ornatus,* however, is a forgotten name — indeed, a canonical example of a forgotten name. The name has never been 'applied to a particular taxon as its presumably valid name' in any zoologically meaningful way; for it has been applied only to a single broken bone of dubious provenience, a bone that no previous author has identified anatomically and that none has classified more precisely than to refer it to 'the Dinosauria'. Recently Olshevsky, 1978, on the basis of information received from the author, has listed *Tylosteus* Leidy, 1872 [nomen oblitum] as a synonym under *Pachycephalosaurus,* and *Tylosteus ornatus* Leidy, 1872 [nomen oblitum] as a synonym under *P. wyomingensis.* Otherwise, the most recent reference to it was published more than fifty years ago (Gilmore, 1928).

7. *Pachycephalosaurus,* on the other hand, has been used extensively in both primary and secondary scientific literature and in innumerable semi-popular and popular publications. The appended bibliography lists a dozen publications by as many different authors in which *Pachycephalosaurus* is cited as the valid generic name. (This list could be extended, for in fact no author has referred to the genus by any other name). The universally-accepted family-name PACHYCE-

PHALOSAURIDAE Sternberg, 1945, p. 535 and the sub-order name Pachycephalosauria Maryánska & Osmólska, 1974 are both based upon it.

8. To replace the universally used name *Pachycephalosaurus* with an unused and hitherto enigmatic name would be an inexcusable violation of the principles of stability and universality. Therefore the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested:

(1) to suppress under the plenary powers the generic name *Tylosteus* Leidy, 1872, and the specific name *ornatus* published in conjunction with it for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Tylosteus* Leidy, 1872, and the specific name *ornatus* published in conjunction with it, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Indexes of Rejected and Invalid Generic and Specific Names in Zoology, respectively;

(3) to place the generic name *Pachycephalosaurus* Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Pachycephalosaurus grangeri* Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the specific name *wyomingensis* Gilmore, 1931, as published in the binomen *Troödon wyomingensis* (the valid name at the time of this ruling for the type species of *Pachycephalosaurus* Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(5) to place the family name PACHYCEPHALOSAURIDAE Sternberg, 1945 (type genus *Pachycephalosaurus* Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943) on the Official List of Family–Group Names in Zoology.

This application is supported by Dr Hans-Dieter Sues (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, U.S.A.*).

REFERENCES

An asterisk (*) indicates works employing *Pachycephalosaurus*, listed to fulfil the conditions of Article 79(b).

BAIRD, D. 1979. The dome-headed dinosaur *Tylosteus ornatus* Leidy, 1872 (Reptilia: Ornithischia: Pachycephalosauridae). *Notulae naturae Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* vol. 456, pp. 1–11.

*BROWN, B. & SCHLAIKJER, E. M. 1943. A study of the troödont dinosaurs with the description of a new genus and four new species. *Bull. Am. Mus. nat. Hist.* vol. 82(5), pp. 115–150.

CAMP, C. L. 1923. Classification of the lizards. *Bull. Am. Mus. nat. Hist.* vol. 48(11), pp. 289–481.

*COLBERT, E. H. 1961. *Dinosaurs, their discovery and their world.* New York: E. P. Dutton, 300 pp.
*DONG, Z. 1978. A new genus of Pachycephalosauria from Laiyang, Shantung. *Vertebr. Palasiat.* vol. 16(4), pp. 225–228.
*ESTES, R. 1964. Fossil vertebrates from the Late Cretaceous Lance Formation, eastern Wyoming. *Univ. Calif. Publs geol. Sci.* vol. 49, pp. 1–180.
*GALTON, P. M. 1971. A primitive dome-headed dinosaur (Ornithischia: Pachycephalosauridae) from the Lower Cretaceous of England and the function of the dome of pachycephalosaurids. *J. Paleont.* vol. 45(1), pp. 40–47.
GILMORE, C. W. 1928. Fossil lizards of North America. *Mem. natn. Acad. Sci.* vol. 22(3), pp. 1–201.
——— 1931. A new species of troödont dinosaur from the Lance Formation of Wyoming. *Proc. U.S. natn. Mus.* vol. 79(9), pp. 1–6.
HAY, O. P. 1902. Bibliography and catalogue of the fossil Vertebrata of North America. *Bull. U.S. geol. Surv.* vol. 179, 868 pp.
*HUENE, F. VON, 1956. *Palaeontologie und Phylogenie der Niederen Tetrapoden.* Jena: G. Fischer, 716 pp.
LEIDY, J. 1872. Remarks on some extinct vertebrates. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* vol. 1872, pp. 38–40.
——— 1873. Contributions to the extinct vertebrate fauna of the Western Territories. *Rep. U.S. geol. Surv. Terr.* vol. 1, 358 pp.
*MARYANSKA, T. & OSMOLSKA, H. 1974. Pachycephalosauria, a new suborder of ornithischian dinosaurs. *Palaeontol. pol.* vol. 30, pp. 45–102.
*OLSHEVSKY, G. 1978. *The archosaurian taxa (excluding the Crocodylia).* Toronto: G. & T. Enterprises, 50 pp.
*ROMER, A. S. 1956. *Osteology of the reptiles.* Univ. Chicago Press, 772 pp.
*——— 1966. *Vertebrate paleontology.* Univ. Chicago Press, 468 pp.
*STEEL, R. 1969. Ornithischia. *Handb. Palaeoherp.* vol. 15, pp. 1–84.
*STERNBERG, C. M. 1945. Pachycephalosauridae proposed for dome-headed dinosaurs, *Stegoceras lambei*, n.sp., described. *J. Palaeont.* vol. 19(5), pp. 534–538.
*SUES, H.-D. 1978. Functional morphology of the dome in pachycephalosaurid dinosaurs. *Neues Jb. Geol. Palaont. Mh.* vol. 1978(8), pp. 459–472.
*WALL, W. P. & GALTON, P. M. 1979. Notes on pachycephalosaurid dinosaurs (Reptilia: Ornithischia) from North America, with comments on their status as ornithopods. *Can. J. Earth Sci.* vol. 16, pp. 1176–1186.
*WHITE, T. E. 1973. Catalogue of the genera of dinosaurs. *Ann. Carneg. Mus.* vol. 44(9), pp. 117–155.
WILLISTON, S. W. 1925. *The osteology of the reptiles.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 300 pp.

DONAX HANLEYANUS PHILIPPI, 1847, PROPOSED CONSERVATION AND PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *DONAX HILAIREA* GUERIN, 1832 (MOLLUSCA, BIVALVIA). Z.N.(S.)2152

By Walter Narchi (*Departamento de Zoologia, C.P. 20.520, São Paulo, Brazil*)

The aim of this application is to seek conservation of the specific name *hanleyanus* Philippi, 1847 (*Donax*), which has recently been set aside (Morrison, 1971) in favour of the totally forgotten name *hilairea* Guérin, 1832 (*Donax*).

2. Guérin (1832, *Icon. du Règne Anim.* pl. 30, fig. 4) described *Donax hilairea* without indicating a locality.

3. Philippi (1847, *Zeits. f. Malakozool.* vol. 4: p. 84) described *D. hanleyanus*, which is considered to be the same species, also from an unknown locality. This latter name has since been used for the species in question, reported only from the southern part of the Atlantic coast of South America.

4. In his list of synonyms Morrison (1971) cites the following names: *rugosa* Hanley, 5 times (3 misidentifications); *denticulata* Guérin, once (misidentification) and *hanleyana* Philippi, 8 times. This list has definite under-representation of the name *hanleyanus,* but even so, it shows the tendency to apply it.

5. The type localities for *hilairea* and *hanleyanus* are, as shown above, unknown. Morrison (1971) accepted the first locality published by Reeve (1854), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, as designation of the type locality of *D. hanleyanus.*

6. The Commission is requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *hilairea* Guérin, 1832 as cited in the combination *Donax hilairea* for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
(2) to place the name *hanleyanus* Philippi, 1847, as cited in the combination *Donax hanleyanus* on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
(3) to place the name *hilairea* Guérin, 1832, as cited in the combination *Donax hilairea* at (1) above on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

A list of references is held in the Commission's Office to prove that during the last 35 years (from 1944 to 1979) the name *D. hanleyanus* Philippi, 1847 was used at least eleven times by nine different authors, and the senior name has not been used once during that period.

The species *D. hanleyanus* is used by many authors in the area of fisheries concerned with the study of biology, reproductive cycles and migration.

REFERENCES

MORRISON, J. P. E. 1971. Western Atlantic *Donax*. *Proc. biol. Soc. Washington*, vol. 83(48), pp. 566–567.
REEVE, L. A. 1854. *Conchologia Iconica*, vol. 8, pl. II, p. 6.

DROMOPHIS PETERS, 1869 (REPTILIA, SERPENTES): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2375

By Donald G. Broadley (*National Museum, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe*)

The purpose of this application is to suppress the generic name *Philodendros* Fitzinger, 1843, used only once in the literature during the last hundred years, which is a senior synonym of *Dromophis* Peters, 1869.

2. In 1843 Fitzinger erected the genus *Philodendros*, designating *Dendrophis praeornata* Schlegel as type species (*Syst. Rept.*, p. 26).

3. In 1846 Agassiz published the name *Philodendrus*, an unjustified emendation of Fitzinger's name (*Nomen. Zool., Index Univers.*, p. 285).

4. In 1869 W. C. H. Peters erected the monotypic genus *Dromophis* to accommodate *Dendrophis praeornata* Schlegel (*Monatsber. königl. Akad. Wiss. Berlin*, p. 447).

5. In the last revision of the genus, Loveridge cited 42 papers by 16 authors in which the name *Dromophis* was used, but overlooked the name *Philodendros* Fitzinger, 1843 (1940, *Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. Harv.*, vol. 87, pp. 7–12).

6. In 1957 Loveridge pointed out that the name *Philodendros* Fitzinger had priority over *Dromophis* Peters and urged that the Commission be requested to set aside the older name (*Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. Harv.*, vol. 117, pp. 159 and 277).

7. Since 1940 the name *Dromophis* Peters has been used in at least 22 papers by 15 authors. In accordance with Article 79(b) of the Code, approved by the XVII Congress in 1972, the following is a selection of 'at least 5 different authors and in at least 10 publications' in which *Dromophis* has been used during the past 50 years:

(1) Scortecci, G., 1939. *Gli Ofidi Velenosi dell'Africa Italiana*, p. 140.
(2) Bogert, C. M., 1940. *Bull. Am. Mus. nat. Hist.*, vol. 77, pp. 12 and 79.
(3) Loveridge, A., 1953. *Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. Harv.*, vol. 110, p. 273.
(4) Witte, G.-F. de, 1953. *Explor. Parc. natn. Upemba, Miss. G.-F. de Witte*, vol. 6, p. 233.

(5) Laurent, R. F., 1956. *Annls Mus. r. Congo belge Ser. 8 vo,* vol. 48, p. 247.
(6) Perret, J. L., 1961. *Bull. Soc. neuchâtel. Sci. nat.,* vol. 84, p. 136.
(7) Fitzsimons, V. F. M. 1962. *Snakes of Southern Africa,* p. 219.
(8) Underwood, G., 1967. *A contribution to the classification of snakes,* p. 136.
(9) Broadley, D. G., 1971. *Puku,* vol. 6, p. 87.
(10) Pitman, C. R. S., 1974. *A guide to the snakes of Uganda* (Revised Edition), p. 152.

8. Since its establishment, the generic name *Philodendros* Fitzinger has been used only twice: once in its emended form *Philodendrus* by Agassiz (1846, *op. cit.*) and once recently in a list of genera assigned to the tribe Psammophiini of the subfamily Lycodontinae by Dowling & Duellman (1974, *Systematic herpetology,* p. 112b, 3).

9. In the interests of nomenclatural stability the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Philodendros* Fitzinger, 1843, for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
(2) to place the generic name *Dromophis* Peters, 1869 (gender: masculine), type species by monotypy, *Dendrophis praeornata* Schlegel, 1837, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
(3) to place the specific name *praeornata* Schlegel, 1837, as published in the binomen *Dendrophis praeornata* (specific name of the type species of *Dromophis* Peters, 1869), on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
(4) to place the generic name *Philodendros* Fitzinger, 1843, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

	Page
Officers and Members of the Commission	v
Members of the International Trust for Zoological nomenclature	vi
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	129
Special Announcements	130
Address by Professor T.R.E. Southwood, F.R.S., Vice-President, The Royal Society	133
Financial Report for 1982	137
Nomenclature of Organisms considered by some to be animals and by others plants or bacteria (W.D.L. Ride)	140

Opinions

Opinion 1256. *Sorex dsinezumi* Temminck, 1843 (Mammalia, Insectivora)	147
Opinion 1257. *Tipula ferruginea* Fabricius, 1805 (Insecta, Diptera)	149
Opinion 1258. *Ochthera exsculpta* Loew, 1862 (Insecta, Diptera)	151
Opinion 1259. *Ogygiocaris* Angelin, 1854 and *Ogygites* Tromelin & Lebesconte, 1876 (Trilobita)	153
Opinion 1260. *Orthunga* Dohrn, 1859 (Insecta, Hemiptera)	157
Opinion 1261. *Chuangia* Walcott, 1911 and *Shantungia* Walcott, 1905 (Trilobita)	160

New and revived cases

Astacilla Cordiner, 1793 (Crustacea, Isopoda). B. Kensley	163
Hyla femoralis chrysoscelis Cope, 1880 (Amphibia, Anura). H.M. Smith, K.T. Fitzgerald & L.J. Guillette, Jr.	165
Bagrus Bosc, 1816 (Pisces, Siluriformes). R.M. Bailey & D.J. Stewart)	167
Neadmete Habe, 1961 (Gastropoda). R.E. Petit	173
Calymene Brongniart, 1822 (Trilobita). H.B. Whittington	176
Panopea Menard de la Groye, April 1807 (Mollusca, Bivalvia). The Secretary	179
Pachycephalosaurus Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943 and *Troodon wyomingensis* Gilmore, 1931 (Reptilia, Dinosauria): proposed conservation. D. Baird	184
Donax hanleyanus Philippi, 1847 (Mollusca, Bivalvia). W. Narchi	188
Dromophis Peters, 1869 (Reptilia, Serpentes): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. D.G. Broadley	189

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset

ZS 2702

30 December 1983 Volume 40 Part 4
pp. vii–viii, 191–266

ISSN 0007-5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

16 JAN 1984

© International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD

Price £10.00 (All rights reserved).

BRITISH MUSEUM NAT. HIST. 16 JAN 1964 PURCHASED ZOOLOGY LIBRARY

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia).*

Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*

Secretary: Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**

Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 3, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**

Prof. E. BINDER *(Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, CH 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland)* (30 September 1972) **Mollusca**

Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**

Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**

Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**

Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**

Prof. H.E. WELCH *(Department of Zoology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3T 2N2 Canada)* (17 March 1976) **Nematoda**

Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**

Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(President):* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**

Dr. Curtis W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (29 September 1976) *(Councillor)* **Diptera**

Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia; E D P Methods**

Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**

Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN, *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**

Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**
Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**
Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**
Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN, *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**
Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**
Mr. David HEPPELL *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**
Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**
Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**
Dr. SHUNICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3–23–1. Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**
Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Sir Peter E. Kent, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon, F.R.S.C.
Prof. C.B. Cox, T.D.
Prof. D. Curry, F.G.S.
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. W.D.L. Ride *(ex officio)*
Sir Eric Smith, F.R.S.
Dr. G.B. White
Prof. J.M. Dodd, F.R.S. *(Observer for the Royal Society)*

B. The Officers of the Trust

Mr. R.V. Melville, M.Sc. *(Scientific Controller)*
Mr. A. Penrose, B.Sc. *(Assistant Zoologist)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 40, part 4 (pp. 191–266) 30 December 1983

NOTICES

(a) *Date of commencement of voting.* In normal circumstances the Commission may start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications in the present part is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretariat of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretariat before the close of the six-month period.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a-b and 79b):

(1) *Caeparia* Stål, 1877 (Insecta, Dictyoptera): proposed designation of a type species under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2284. L.M. Roth & A.B. Gurney.

(2) Proposal to suppress the first designation of a type species for the generic name *Megilla* Fabricius, 1805, and to place *Macropis* Klug, 1809, on the Official List of Generic Names (Hymenoptera, Apoidea), Z.N.(S.) 2401. C.D. Michener.

*(3) *Boiga* Fitzinger, 1826 (Reptilia, Serpentes): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2404. J.B. Rasmussen & A.F. Stimson.

(4) Glossodoris Ehrenberg, 1831, *Hypselodoris* Stimpson, 1855 and *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855 (Gastropoda, Opisthobranchia): proposed clarification and conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2432. W.B. Rudman.

(5) *Rhinoclama* Dall & Smith, 1886 (Mollusca, Septibranchia): proposed validation of the customary usage. Z.N.(S.) 2151. D. Heppell & R.E. Morgan.

*(6) *Chelydra osceola* Stejneger, 1918 (Reptilia, Testudines): proposed conservation by use of the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2282. H.M. Smith, R.B. Smith & D. Chiszar.

(7) *Bainella* Rennie, 1930 (Arthropoda, Trilobita): proposed conservation under the plenary powers by suppression of *Anchiopella* Reed, 1907. Z.N.(S.) 2368. M.R. Cooper.

(8) *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 and *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2436. D.S. Fletcher & I.W.B. Nye.

(9) NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916 (Gastropoda): revised proposals for conservation. Z.N.(S.) 1987. D. Heppell.

(10) *Tricelia variopedata* Renier, [1807] (Polychaeta): proposed conservation of the specific name. Z.N.(S.) 1093. The Secretary.

*(11) *Euphaedra* Hübner, [1819] (Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 1686. C.F.Cowan.

*(12) *Ourocnemis* Baker, 1887 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 1687. C.F. Cowan.

(13) *Ceroplesis* Serville, 1835 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed designation of a type species under the plenary powers, Z.N.(S.) 2180. R.C. Marinoni.

(14) *Rallus tabuensis* Gmelin, 1789 (Aves): proposed conservation under the plenary powers by the suppression of *Rallus nigra* (*sic*) Miller, 1784, Z.N.(S.) 2276. M.D. Bruce, D.T. Holyoak & J.-C. Thibault.

*(15) *Zeugophora* Kunze, 1818 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2405. H. Silfverberg.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since the publication of vol. 40(3) on 21 October 1983 (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b.):

(1) *Tomiopsis* Benediktova, 1956 (Spiriferida, Brachiopoda): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2451. N.W. Archbold and G.A. Thomas.

(2) *Aphrodita imbricata* Linnaeus, 1767 & *Aphrodita minuta,* Fabricius, 1780 (Annelida, Polychaeta): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2452. S. Chambers & D. Heppell.

*(3) *Microchrysa* Loew, 1855 (Insecta, Diptera, Stratiomyidae): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2453. E.P. Nartshuk & R. Rozkošný.

*(4) *Musca trilineata* Linnaeus, 1767 (Insecta, Diptera): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2454. E.P. Nartshuk & R. Roskošný.

*(5) *Physophycus bilobatus* Lesquereux, 1890 (Arthropoda Trace Fossil): proposed designation as a nomen oblitum. Z.N.(S.) 2455. R.M. Feldmann.

*(6) *Rhopalocerus* W. Redtenbacher, 1842 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2456. M. Mroczkowski.

(7) *Fucus* Hudson, 1762 (Bryozoa, Ctenostomata): proposal for suppression. Z.N.(S.) 2457. J.P. Thorpe & J.E. Winston.

(8) Description of taxa based on enzymes. Z.N.(S.) 2458. J.E. Jelnes.

(9) *Oculata* D'Orbigny & Bibron, 1837 (Reptilia, Sauria): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2459. J. Lescure & J.Cei.

(10) *Ammonites chrishna* Forbes, 1846 (Mollusca): proposed suppression of specific name under plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2460. R.A. Henderson & W.J. Kennedy.

*(11) *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Krøyer, 1837) Krøyer, 1863 (Copepoda, Caligidae): request to conserve. Z.N.(S.) 2461. L. Margolis & B. Berland.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Since the last list of donors to the Appeal Fund was published in volume 40 part 3, donations have been received from:

Royal Danish Academy of Sciences; the Lesley David Trust (further donation); Dr J.S.G. Lund; the Palaeontographical Society; the Society of Protozoologists (British Section); the Systematics Association; and the Unione Zoologica Italiana. Including £45,000 invested long-term, the net balance of the Appeal Fund stood at over £51,000 on 18 November 1983.

The International Union of Biological Sciences has decided to give the Trust US $5,000 in 1984 with the prospect of a like sum in 1985. This has enabled the British Research Councils (except for that for Social Sciences) and the Royal Society to fulfil their conditional promises to provide £9,000 a year for the present and the next two financial years. This welcome news will, we hope, be followed by support on a similar scale from other national adhering bodies of IUBS so that the work of the Commission can be realistically funded in future. It is desirable that support be spread proportionately between as many countries as possible so as to maintain the truly international character of the Commission and its sustaining agency, the Trust.

INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Editorial Committee's final draft of the third edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature was submitted for a vote by the Commission on 5 August 1983. There were three voting papers, V.P. (83) 18, 19, 20. At the close of the voting period on 5 November 1983 the result of the votes was as follows:

V.P.18 on the treatment of species-group names formed from personal names and ending in *-i* or *-ii*: 12 votes in favour of treating subsequent variations between these two spellings as erroneous subsequent spellings and 6 against, with one abstention.

V.P.19 on agreeing or disagreeing that the instructions given by the Division of Zoology at IUBS in 1979 to the Commission had been carried out: 18 agreed, 1 disagreed, 1 abstention.

V.P.20 for or against publishing the drafts submitted as the third edition of the Code: 19 for, 2 against.

One late set of votes was received. Four voting papers were not returned.

The Editorial Committee is now considering the comments sent in by members of the Commission with their voting papers. It is hoped to conclude this phase so that the two texts can be sent to the printer before the end of the year. The date of publication and price will be announced as soon as possible.

INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF THE BULLETIN

The price of the *Bulletin* has been stable at £40 a year since January 1981. From January 1984, however, the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux (with the agreement of the Trust) has announced that the price will be increased to £42 (US$ 85.00) a year. There will be no increase for the time being in the cost per page of authors' reprints above the 25 free copies.

The following concessionary rates are available: for regular subscribers who pay for two years in advance, a 5% discount (£79.80; US$ 161.50); for new subscribers a 35% discount for the first year (£27.30; US$55.25); for staff members of organisations whose libraries subscribe at the full rate, a personal discount of 50% (£21; US$42.50).

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
November 1983

FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES FOR *ANOLIS* DAUDIN, 1802. Z.N.(S.)1603
(see vol. 20, pp. 438–439; vol. 40, pp. 15–19)

(1) By Jay M. Savage (*Department of Biology, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida 33124*)

The recent comments regarding the 1963 proposal by Smith, Williams & Lazell to fix the type species of *Anolis* presented by Sabrosky and by Stimson & Underwood are essentially correct. However, the underemphasis on the result of fixing *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Anolis*, as designated by Stejneger in 1904 creates problems that are best resolved by accepting the proposal of Smith, Williams & Lazell to designate *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt, 1832 as type species, by fiat of the Commission.

Etheridge, 1967, p. 171, in the interim between the Smith, Williams & Lazell proposal and those of Sabrosky and Stimson & Underwood, split *Anolis* into two species groups, the alpha and beta sections, based on differences in caudal vertebrae. While he did not formally recognise the groups as distinct genera, all subsequent workers on the genus recognise that the name *Anolis* referred to alpha anoles and *Norops* Wagler, 1830 (type species, by monotypy, *Anolis auratus* Daudin, 1802) to beta anoles. This practice, deeply embedded in the minds of students in this field, would be reversed by Sabrosky and Stimson & Underwood's proposal. Alpha anoles would then become *Deiroptyx* Fitzinger, 1843 (type species, by original designation, *Anolis vermiculatus* Duméril & Bibron, 1837), and the betas would become *Anolis*.

While the proposals of Sabrosky and Stimson & Underwood, had they been published and acted on earlier, are correct under strict interpretation of the rules, the intervening 20 years of custom and usage counter their arguments for stability. For these reasons I now support completely the request of Smith, Williams & Lazell, 1963, although I opposed it on the same grounds as Sabrosky and Stimson & Underwood at the time it was made.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

FITZINGER, L. J. F. J. 1843. *Systema Reptilium*. Vienna, 106 VI pp.
WAGLER, J. 1830. *Naturliches System der Amphibien* . . . Munich, VI 354 pp.

(2) Reply by A. F. Stimson & G. L. Underwood

Since 1967 workers generally have referred to Etheridge's two groups simply as alpha anoles and beta anoles, placing both groups in the genus *Anolis* without formal use of subgeneric names. The only exception of which we are aware is Savage (1980, pp. 69–73; 1982, pp. 468, 475, 509, 519) who used *Anolis* for alpha anoles and *Norops* for beta anoles. We do not consider this to represent '20 years of custom and usage'.

REFERENCES

SAVAGE, J. M. 1980. *A handlist with preliminary keys to the herpetofauna of Costa Rica*. 111 pp.

——1982. The enigma of the Central American herpetofauna: dispersal or vicariance? *Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 69*, pp. 464–547.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF TEIIDAE GRAY, 1827. Z.N.(S.)1920
(see vol. 38, pp. 194–196; vol. 39, pp. 157–158)

By Andrew Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

The family-group name TEIIDAE is so well entrenched in the herpetological literature that there can be no doubt that the use of the plenary powers to conserve it is justified. I agree with Smith, Smith & Chiszar (vol. 39, pp. 157–158) that those powers need not be used in relation to the unavailable TUPINAMBIDAE and support their use to give TEIIDAE precedence over AMEIVIDAE.

There are, however, a couple of errors in Presch's original proposal that should be corrected. He states that the type species of *Teius* Merrem, 1820 is *Lacerta teyou* Daudin, 1802, by monotypy, and that that of *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802 is *Lacerta teguixin* Linnaeus, 1758, also by monotypy. Since both genera originally included several nominal species neither type species can be fixed by monotypy.

Teius Merrem was based on seven species regarded as valid: viz: *Teius viridis* sp. nov. (with *Lacerta teyou* Daudin, 1802 in synonymy); *L. lemniscata* Linnaeus; *L. ameiva* Linnaeus; *'L. monitor* Bonnat.', i.e. *Tupinambis monitor* Daudin; *Teius cyaneus* sp. nov.; *L. bicarinata* Linnaeus; and *Teius crocodilinus* sp. nov. No type species was designated in the original description. In their checklist of South American lizards, Burt & Burt (1933, p. 76) gave *viridis* as the type species of *Teius,* all the other originally included species having been earlier placed in other genera. *Teius viridis* is without doubt a junior synonym of *Teius teyou* (Daudin), the only species currently recognised in this genus. Thus, while the biological type species is *Teius teyou* (Daudin) and that is the valid name for that species, the nominal type species should be cited as *Teius viridis* Merrem, 1820, p. 60, by subsequent designation by Burt & Burt, 1933, p. 76.

In the genus *Tupinambis* Daudin a similar situation exists. The 12 originally included species were: *Tupinambis monitor* sp. nov.; *T. elegans* sp. nov.; *T. cepedianus* sp. nov.; *T. indicus* sp. nov.; *T. maculatus* sp. nov.; *Lacerta nilotica* Linnaeus; *T. stellatus* sp. nov.; *T. bengalensis* sp. nov.; *T. albigularis* sp. nov.; *T. variegatus* sp. nov.; *Lacerta exanthematica* Bosc.; and *T. lacertina* sp. nov. The first-mentioned of these, *T. monitor,* contained among its cited synonyms *Temapara tupinambis* Ray, 1693, p. 265. Thus the type species of *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802, p. 5 is *Tupinambis monitor* Daudin, 1802, p. 20, by absolute tautonymy through *Temapara tupinambis* Ray. This is the only one of the originally included species remaining in the genus. *T. monitor* is generally regarded as a synonym of *T. teguixin* (Linnaeus) sensu Boulenger (1885, p. 335), i.e. *T. rufescens* Günther sensu Presch (1973, p. 743) although Presch (p. 741) placed it in the synonymy of *T. teguixin* sensu Presch, i.e. *T. nigropunctatus*

Spix sensu Boulenger (1885, p. 337). Although the type specimen(s) appears to be lost (Guibé, 1954), it is clear that Daudin's concept of *T. monitor* was a broad one. He cites several Seba and Merian plates that between them depict examples of both *T. teguixin* (sensu Boulenger) and *T. nigropunctatus*. Thus, until a lectotype or neotype is designated, *T. monitor* should be regarded as a composite. This does not prevent this nominal species adequately serving as the type of the genus. The two component species are closely related and no worker has ever suggested, or is likely to suggest, that they do not belong to the same genus-group taxon.

REFERENCES

BURT, C. E. & BURT, M. D. 1933. A preliminary checklist of the lizards of South America. *Trans. Acad. Sci. St Louis*, vol. 28, pp. 1–104.

GUIBE, J. 1954. *Catalogue des types de lézards du Muséum national d'Histoire Naturelle*. 119 pp. (Paris).

PRESCH, W. 1973. A review of the tegus, lizard genus *Tupinambis* (Sauria: Teiidae) from South America. *Copeia*, 1973, pp. 740–746.

RAY, J. 1693. *Synopsis methodica animalium quadrupedum et serpentini generis*, 336 pp. (London).

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *DENDROBATES* WAGLER, 1830 AND DENDROBATIDAE COPE, 1865. Z.N.(S.)1930

(see vol. 39, pp. 264–278)

(1) By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, Netherlands*)

I do not agree with M. Dubois that *Dendrobates* is a replacement name for *Hylaplesia* merely because *Hylaplesia* was cited in the synonymy of *Dendrobates* when the latter was established. Wagler nowhere stated that he intended to replace the name *Hylaplesia*, neither did he say that *Dendrobates* covered all of *Hylaplesia*. Actually he said that he knew of two species of *Hylaplesia*. An example of an often-used kind of synonymy in a newly established name is (a fictitious case): '*Macrobrachium* nov. gen. (=*Palaemon* Fabricius, 1798; *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775; *Cancer* Linnaeus, 1758)'. The author of the new name only wants to indicate that the species that he brings into the new genus were placed by Linnaeus, 1758, in *Cancer*, by Fabricius, 1775, in *Astacus*, and later removed to his genus *Palaemon* (1798). This cannot be taken to mean that *Macrobrachium* is intended as a replacement name for the other three.

Another example: take a genus *A-us* Jones, 1850, type species *A-us albus* Jones, 1850, by monotypy, to which *A-us niger* Smith, 1875 and *A-us ruber* Baker, 1900 are later referred. If I discover that *A-us* Jones, 1850 is preoccupied by *A-us* Carpenter, 1800, I may erect a new genus *B-us* with the same three species but designate *ruber* Baker as the type species with *A-us* Jones non Carpenter in synonymy. *B-us* is then not a new replacement name (*nomen novum*) for *A-us* Jones because its genus has a different type species.

Hence the type species of *Dendrobates* is *Rana tinctoria* Cuvier by subsequent designation by Duméril & Bibron and there is no need to use the plenary powers to attain this end.

As to the authorship of the names proposed in Schlegel, 1826 and 1827, this is in both cases Schlegel, not Boie in Schlegel. The text of both papers (of which the second is a German translation of the first) is by Schlegel except that some of Boie's names are cited with indications sufficient to make them available. None of the descriptions in Boie's much longer MS (which is at Leiden) is quoted. *Hylaplesia* Schlegel, 1827 is not an emendation of *Hysaplesia* Schlegel, 1826 but an incorrect subsequent spelling. It may well be that *Hysaplesia* is a lapsus for *Hylaplesia*, but as this is not obvious from the original publication alone, it cannot be taken into account here. As *Dendrobates* is not a replacement name for *Hysaplesia*, whatever type species is fixed for *Dendrobates* is not automatically the type species of *Hysaplesia*. Hence Stejneger's 1937 selection of *Hyla punctata* Daudin as type species of *Hysaplesia* must stand. *Hysaplesia* thereby becomes a junior subjective synonym of *Hyla* Laurenti, 1768 and there is no need to suppress this name. Nor is there any need to suppress the unavailable name *Hylaplesia* Schlegel, 1827.

Personally, I am not impressed by the arguments for giving DENDROBATIDAE precedence over PHYLLOBATIDAE. I should like to see proposal (1) dropped, (4) taken without the endorsement, and all mention of the plenary powers removed from (5) and (6). *Hysaplesia* should not be placed on the Official Index.

(2) By Alain Dubois (*Laboratoire des Reptiles et Amphibiens, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 25 rue Cuvier, 75005 Paris, France*)

I disagree with HOLTHUIS (1983) on the status of the generic name *Dendrobates*, which I persist to consider as a strict replacement name for *Hylaplesia*. This opinion is based on a careful examination of WAGLER's texts, rather than on general statements or principles, or on fictitious or idealised examples. We have given elsewhere arguments to show that application of the *Code* to old, 'pre-*Code*' texts, 'must be made with care, understanding and intelligence' (BOUR & DUBOIS, 1983). In the present case, and although WAGLER (1830) did not use the words 'replacement name' (a phrase which did not exist in his times), a careful examination of his 1830 text clearly shows that, as explained before (DUBOIS, 1982b), names like *Asterodactylus, Dendrobates, Enydrobius* or *Systoma* were introduced by him strictly as replacement names for names considered by him, for some reason, as inappropriate. Instead of discussing this in detail in this *Bulletin*, I think it simpler and more convincing to refer the readers to WAGLER's (1830) original text itself. Other arguments could also be found by studying the other publications of WAGLER. For example, WAGLER (1827) presented his new name *Asterodactylus* as follows: '(*Asterodactylus m. Pipa* Auctor.)', which confirms the interpretation of *Asterodactylus* as a replacement name for *Pipa* already presented (DUBOIS, 1982b).

2. SCHLEGEL's paper (1826, reprinted 1827) is not based on personal observations of SCHLEGEL, but on the study of manuscripts by BOIE (and also by KUHL & VAN HASSELT). SCHLEGEL had not seen the species he refers

to, and the short diagnostic indications he gives are drawn from the original manuscripts. I feel therefore that BOIE 'is alone responsible both for the name and the conditions that make it available' (Art. 50) and is to be considered as the author of the names *Hysaplesia* and *Hylaplesia.*

3. Finally, it seems clear to me that in BOIE and SCHLEGEL's manuscripts the latter name must have been spelled *Hylaplesia* and that the misspelling *Hysaplesia* was due to the publishers of the *Bull. Sci. nat. Géol.*, but that the same mistake was not made by those of *Isis von Oken.* Since the spelling *Hylaplesia* has been widely used by various authors since its creation (while the spelling *Hysaplesia* remained ignored until STEJNEGER's (1937) paper), this name, on which is based the family-group name HYLAPLESIDAE, is better considered as having an independent status in nomenclature (for more detailed discussions of other similar cases, see DUBOIS, 1982a). It seems therefore appropriate to consider *Hysaplesia* as the 'correct original spelling' of the name in the sense of the *Code*, and *Hylaplesia* as an unjustified emendation of the latter (DUBOIS, 1982b).

4. In conclusion, I see nothing to change in my previous application (DUBOIS, 1982b).

REFERENCES

BOUR, R. & DUBOIS, A. 1983. Nomenclatural availability of *Testudo coriacea* Vandelli, 1761: a case against a rigid application of the Rules to old well-known zoological works. *J. Herpetol.*, vol. 17, no. 4.

DUBOIS, A. 1982a. Le statut nomenclatural des noms génériques d'Amphibiens Anoures créés par Kuhl & Van Hasselt (1822): *Megophrys. Occidozyga* et *Rhacophorus. Bull. Mus. natn. Hist. nat.*, (4), vol. 4 (A), pp. 261–280.

—— 1982b. *Dendrobates* Wagler, 1830 and Dendrobatidae Cope. 1865 (Amphibia, Anura): proposed conservation. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 39, pp. 267–278.

SCHLEGEL, H. 1826. Notice sur l'erpétologie de l'île de Java; par M. Boie (Ouvrage manuscrit). *Bull. Sci. nat. Géol.*, vol. 9, pp. 233–240.

—— 1827. Erpetologische Nachrichten. *Isis von Oken*, vol. 20, col. 281–294.

STEJNEGER, L. 1937. Designation of genotype for *Hylaplesia* Boie. *Copeia*, 1937, p. 139.

WAGLER, J. 1827. Footnote. *In:* H. Boie an Wagler. *Isis von Oken*, vol. 20, col. 726.

—— 1830. *Natürliches System der Amphibien, mit vorangehender Classification der Säugethiere und Vögel.* München, Stuttgart & Tübingen, Cotta: i–vi + 1–354 pp.

OPINION 1262
CANCER VOCANS MAJOR HERBST, 1782 (CRUSTACEA, DECAPODA): NEOTYPE DESIGNATED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers, the lectotype of *Gelasimus platydactylus* Milne Edwards, 1837 designated by Holthuis, 1979, p. 251 and mentioned by Crance, 1975, p. 601, is hereby designated as the neotype of *Cancer vocans major* Herbst, 1782 (see entry No. 2019 in the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology).

(2) The specific name *tangeri* Eydoux, 1835, as published in the binomen *Gelasimus tangeri,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2873.

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *platydactylus* H. Milne Edwards, 1837, as published in the binomen *Gelasimus platydactylus* (a junior objective synonym of *Cancer vocans major* Herbst, 1782, through the neotype designation made under the plenary powers in (1) above) (Name Number 1125);

(b) *uka* Shaw & Nodder, 1803, as published in the binomen *Cancer uka* (a junior objective synonym of *Cancer vocans major* Herbst, 1782) (Name Number 1126).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2235

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a neotype for *Cancer vocans major* Herbst, 1782, was first received from Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, Netherlands*) on 19 October 1977. It was sent to the printer on 18 July 1978 and published on 31 May 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 248–252. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general serials and one specialist serial. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)30 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 248–252. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Uéno, Willink, Sabrosky, Corliss, Halvorsen, Schuster, Kraus, Brinck, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Dupuis, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Cogger, Welch, Ride

Negative Vote — Savage.

Bernardi was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Binder and Lehtinen.

Savage commented: 'It seems to me that the best solution here is to suppress the name *major* and conserve the names *tangeri* and *platydactylus*. Dr Holthuis himself points out this solution in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 249. *Gelasimus platycephalus* would have to be designated the type species of *Uca* as well. I oppose the application.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

platydactylus, Gelasimus, H. Milne Edwards, 1837, *Hist. nat. Crust.*, vol. 2, p. 51

tangeri, Gelasimus, Eydoux, 1835, *Mag. Zool. Paris,* vol. 5 (7), unnumbered page

uka, Cancer, Shaw & Nodder, 1803, *Naturalist's Miscellany,* vol. 14, pl. 588.

The following is the original reference to the proposition of a neotype designation ratified by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

for *Cancer vocans major* Herbst, 1782 by Holthuis, L. B. 1979, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 251.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (1982)30 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1262.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
15 August 1983

OPINION 1263
PROTOTOMUS VIVERRINUS COPE, 1874 (MAMMALIA): REFUSAL TO DESIGNATE A NEOTYPE UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) The request to use the plenary powers to designate a neotype for the nominal species *Prototomus viverrinus* Cope, 1874, is hereby refused.

(2) The specific name *viverrinus* Cope, 1874, as published in the binomen *Prototomus viverrinus,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2874.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1631

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a neotype for *Prototomus viverrinus* Cope, 1874 was first received from Dr Leigh Van Valen on 9 January 1964. After exchanges of correspondence, a revised application was sent to the printer on 3 March 1967 and published on 27 April 1967 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 24, pp. 93–94. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the prescribed publications. An objection to the proposal was received from Dr E. Lindsay (*Department of Geology, University of Arizona*).

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 3 April 1969 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (69)17 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 24, p. 94. At the close of the voting period on 3 July 1969 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — three (3) received in the following order: China, Bonnet, Starobogatov

Negative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Holthuis, Evans, Lemche, Simpson, Vokes, Obruchev, Melville, Brinck, Mayr, do Amaral, Jaczewski, Sabrosky, Forest, Uchida, Eisenmann, Ride, Mertens, Binder.

Alvarado returned a late affirmative vote and Kraus a late negative vote. No votes were returned by Munroe and Tortonese.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'The application is very incomplete. No author or date is given for the generic names *Sinopa* and *Stypolophus,* so that one

cannot make out whether these are senior or junior synonyms of *Prototomus*. Nothing is said of the usage of the various names.'

Vokes: 'The type specimen, though damaged, is still extant and certainly should reveal significant diagnostic characters. While it is true that most students of fossil mammals have come to rely almost entirely on dentition, to state that the snout and dentition are the "only diagnostic parts" seems rather far fetched.'

Melville: 'In view of Dr Lindsay's comment I think this application is premature. A ruling by the Commission should not be asked for until topotypes of *P. viverrinus* have been collected and examined.'

Brinck: 'The name should be suppressed or left alone until adequate collecting from the type horizon clears the case. This is one of numerous cases in palaeontology. I should be reluctant to start solving them in the way proposed by the applicant.'

Ride: 'The author claims, but does not demonstrate, a chaotic nomenclatural situation; he merely demonstrates uncertainty about allocating a small quantity of apparently rare material. He does not demonstrate that allocating any of the type material to any of the possible taxa will cause upset and I do not think that a case has been made for action under the plenary powers.'

'Has AMBLOCTONIDAE been used? Will upset be caused by its replacing PALAEONICTIDAE? A separate case might be made for this.'

Kraus: 'I partially vote against the proposal; I agree with the proposals on the family-group names in question.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following is the original reference to a name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

viverrinus, Prototomus, Cope, 1874, *Ann Rep. Chief Engineers* (U.S.), Appendix FF (not seen).

NOTE ON THE PROCEDURE ADOPTED IN THIS CASE

Although the proposal to place *viverrinus, Prototomus,* on the Official List 'as interpreted by the neotype' was rejected, an entry in the Official List is the only way in which the fact can be recorded that that specific name has been considered by the Commission. The reasons for the delay in publishing this Opinion cannot now be ascertained.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(69)17 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has

been rejected, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1263.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
29 September 1983

POSTSCRIPT

Dr Philip Gingerich (*University of Michigan*) has shown in *J. Mamm.* vol. 63, pp. 706–709, 1982, that, while the missing type specimen may have belonged to one of two orders (Creodonta, Carnivora), Dr Van Valen's proposed neotype is certainly of the order Condylarthra, and hence in any case belongs in a different order from *Prototomus viverrinus*.

R.V.M.
November 1983

CAEPARIA STÅL, 1877 (INSECTA, DICTYOPTERA): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2284

By Louis M. Roth (*U.S. Army Research & Development Command, Natick, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*) and Ashley B. Gurney (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, U.S.D.A. c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C., U.S.A.*)

Application is hereby made for official designation of a type species of *Caeparia* Stål, 1877 to preserve long-standing usage. This case of a misidentified type species is being referred to the Commission in accordance with Article 70(a) of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature.

2. Stål in 1877 (*Öfv. Sv. Vet.-Akad. Förhandl.*, vol. 34 (10), p. 37) erected the subgenus *Caeparia* including the single species, *Panesthia mandarinea* Saussure. *P. mandarinea* was first described by Saussure in 1863 (*Mém. Soc. Phys. Hist. nat. Genève*, vol. 17, p. 168) and again in 1869 (*ibid.*, vol. 20, p. 286); the former specimen was from China and the latter was from India. In 1876 Wood-Mason (*J. Asiat. Soc. Bengal*, vol. 45, p. 190) reported that Saussure in 1869 had been confused about the sexes of the two specimens identified as *mandarinea* and that Saussure had placed two different species under the single name; Wood-Mason, in the same 1876 paper, renamed Saussure's 1869 species *Panesthia saussurii*. Stål's 1877 diagnosis of *Caeparia* included characters pertaining to *Panesthia mandarinea* as Saussure described it in 1869 rather than in 1863.

3. Usage has varied and has produced a confusion of names and generic interpretations since 1877. Brunner in 1893 (Rev. Syst. Orth., *Ann. Mus. Stor. nat. Genova* (2), vol. 33, p. 88) accepted the genus *Caeparia*, with type-species *C. mandarinea*; it is evident from the locality that *mandarinea* in Brunner's usage was that of Saussure, 1869. Saussure in 1895 (*Rev. suisse Zool.*, vol. 3, p. 305) followed Wood-Mason's 1876 interpretation of two species being confused under *P. mandarinea*, and he referred to *Caeparia saussurei* Wood-Mason as type species of *Caeparia*.

4. Because Saussure apparently had one species under *P. mandarinea* in 1863, and another in 1869, the name can correctly refer only to the 1863 one. This left the 1869 species without a name, and Wood-Mason's *P. saussurii* applies. Kirby in 1904 (*Syn. Cat. Orth.*, vol. 1, p. 201) and Hanitsch in 1932 (*Ann. Mus. civ. Genova*, vol. 56, p. 86) both accepted the name *Caeparia saussurii* Wood-Mason, 1876, thus recognising the type species in the sense of Saussure's 1869 species.

5. Caudell, 1924 (*Philipp. J. Sci.*, vol. 24, p. 646), who regarded *Caeparia* as a junior synonym of *Panesthia*, is virtually the only specialist to adopt the interpretation of *P. mandarinea* Saussure, 1863

as the type species of *Caeparia*. His action apparently resulted from his interpretation of the priority of the name *mandarinea* Saussure, regardless of the misidentification that was made by Stål in 1877. Princis, 1950 (*Opusc. Entomol.*, vol. 15, p. 165, footnote 1) corrected this error.

6. Roth, 1979 (*Aust. J. Zool.*, Suppl. Ser. No. 69) published a monograph of the PANESTHIINAE, which recognises *Caeparia* as a valid genus within the tribe CAEPARIINI. He also summarised the complex synonymy of *Caeparia saussurii*.

7. Acceptance of Stål's (1877) designation of *P. mandarinea* Saussure, 1863 as the type species of *Caeparia* would validate the action of Caudell (1924) and that of Brunner (1893) insofar as he cited *mandarinea* as type species of *Caeparia* (but was clearly looking at *saussurii*!). The usage of Saussure (1895), Kirby (1904), Hanitsch (1932) and Roth (1979), all of whom accepted *saussurii* as the type species of *Caeparia*, would be disregarded. Brunner's (1893) acceptance of *Caeparia* would also be disregarded. We reject this view because it is not in the best interests of stability of nomenclature.

8. On the other hand, acceptance of *saussurii* as the type species of *Caeparia* would achieve greater stability of nomenclature, in that all the actions of Caudell would be invalidated, while those of Brunner would be valid with respect to his use of the generic name *Caeparia*, but invalid in his generic assignment of the species *mandarinea*.

9. The spelling of *saussurii* has differed; *saussurii* was used by Wood-Mason in 1876 and several subsequent authors, including Princis, 1950 (*Ark. Zool.* (2), vol. 1, p. 204). Saussure, 1895 used *saussurei*. However, Princis, 1965 (*Orth. Cat.*, vol. 7, p. 328) regarded *saussurii* as a *lapsus calami* and emended it to *saussurei*. We reject *saussurei* under Article 33(a) (ii) of the Code because *saussurii* is a latinised form of patronymic such as was used by various 'old-time' classical scholars.

10. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species made prior to the present Ruling for the nominal genus *Caeparia* Stål, 1877, and, having done so, to designate *Panesthia saussurii* Wood-Mason, 1876, as the type species of *Caeparia* Stål, 1877;

(2) to place the generic name *Caeparia* Stål, 1877 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Panesthia saussurii* Wood-Mason, 1876, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *saussurii* Wood-Mason, 1876, as published in the binomen *Panesthia saussurii* (specific name of type species of *Caeparia* Stål, 1877) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

PROPOSAL TO SUPPRESS THE FIRST DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES FOR THE GENERIC NAME *MEGILLA* FABRICIUS, 1805, AND TO PLACE *MACROPIS* KLUG, 1809, ON THE OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES (HYMENOPTERA, APOIDEA). Z.N.(S.)2401

By Charles D. Michener (*Department of Entomology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, U.S.A.*)

The generic name *Megilla* Fabricius, 1805, p. 328, was proposed to include 33 species now assigned to diverse families of bees. Among these species were *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Megilla labiata* Fabricius, 1805.

2. Westwood, 1840, p. 158 designated *Megilla labiata* Fabricius, 1805, as the type species of *Megilla.*

3. A second designation of a type species for *Megilla* was by Richards, 1935, p. 172, who selected *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species.

4. The first type species designated, *Megilla labiata* Fabricius, is also the type species by monotypy of *Macropis* Klug, 1809, no. 109, fig. 16, a well known genus of the bee family MELITTIDAE. Thus strict application of the Rules would result in replacement of *Macropis* as a junior objective synonym of *Megilla,* a step not yet taken by any author.

5. The name *Megilla* was used by several authors as a generic name for bees of various families during the period 1805 to 1810. Thereafter it was used only rarely (about five times), always in the sense of *Anthophora* Latreille, 1803, apparently the last significant usage being by Dalla Torre & Friese, 1895. Since that date the name *Megilla* seems not to have appeared in the literature except in synonymies, literature references, and the like, with the exception of Strand's 1916 usage of it when replacing a homonym. The only current function of the name *Megilla* is as a root for names such as *Amegilla, Aframegilla, Paramegilla,* and *Zonamegilla*; all these taxa are close relatives of *Anthophora.*

6. The second designation of a type species for *Megilla* is in accordance with the usage of the nineteenth century, *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus being the type species of *Anthophora* Latreille, 1803 [*Apis pilipes* Fabricius, 1775 = *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus, 1758, designated by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Hemming, 1944).] With this type species for *Megilla,* this name becomes a junior synonym of *Anthophora.*

7. *Macropis* has been and is in regular use, and has provided the root for family group names. Since Fabricius' work in 1805, no species of *Macropis* has been referred to the genus *Megilla.* As strict application of the rules would result in replacement of *Macropis* by the almost unused name *Megilla,* the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species made for the nominal genus *Megilla* Fabricius, 1805, prior to the designation by Richards, 1935, of *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of that genus;
(2) to place the name *Macropis* Klug, 1809 (type species, by monotypy, *Megilla labiata* Fabricius [1805]) on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

It may be noted that essentially these same requests were made by Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1937, 1947, but appear never to have been ruled upon by the Commission.

Finally, it is worth noting that although *Macropis* is of no economic importance it has been of some special interest because it is perhaps the only pollinator of *Lysimachia* (Primulaceae) and because it collects oil rather than nectar from *Lysimachia* flowers.

A list of ten references to *Macropis*, by five different authors within the last fifty years, is held in the Commission's Office.

REFERENCES

BENSON, R. B., FERRIÈRE, C. & RICHARDS, O. W. 1937. *The generic names of British Insects, pt. 5. The generic names of the British Hymenoptera Aculeata, with a check list of British species*, pp. 79–149. R. Entomol. Soc. London.

——1947. Proposed suspension of the Règles for *Macropis* (Klug MS.) Panzer, [1806–1809], and *Megilla* Fabricius, [1804–1805]. *Bull. Zool. Nomen.*, vol. 1, p. 210.

DALLA-TORRE, C. G. DE & FRIESE, H. 1895. Synonymischer Katalog der europäischen Sammelbienen. *Entom. Nachr.*, vol. 21, pp. 21–80.

FABRICIUS, J. C. [1805]. Systema Piezatorum, Brunsvig, xiv + 440 + 30 pp. [See Richards, 1935, for comment on the date.]

HEMMING, F. 1944. On the status of the names *Lasius* Panzer, [1801–1802], *Podalirius* Latreille, 1802, *Lasius* Fabricius, [1804–1805], and *Anthophora* Latreille, 1803. *Opinions and declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*, Opinion 151, pp. 169–177.

KLUG, J. C. F. *in* PANZER, G. W. F. 1809. *Faunae Insectorum Germaniae Initiae*. Heft. 107, Nurnberg.

LATREILLE, P. A. 1803. *Nouveau Dictionnaire d'Histoire Naturelle* [Déterville], vol. 18, p. 168, Paris.

RICHARDS, O. W. 1935. Notes on the nomenclature of the aculeate Hymenoptera, with special reference to British genera and species. *Trans. r. Entomol. Soc. London*, vol. 83, pp. 143–176.

STRAND, E. 1916. Ubersicht der in Gistel's 'Achthundert und zwanzig neue oder unbeschriebene wirbellose Thiere' (1857) behandelten Insekten. *Archiv Naturgeschichte*, vol. 82, Abt. A, Heft 5, pp. 75–100.

WESTWOOD, J. O. 1840. *An introduction to the modern classification of insects ... vol. 2. Synopsis of the genera of British Insects*, London, 585 pp.

BOIGA FITZINGER, 1826 (REPTILIA, SERPENTES): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2404

By Jens B. Rasmussen (*Zoologisk Museum, 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark*) and Andrew F. Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), London SW7 5BD*)

Boiga Fitzinger (1826, pp. 29, 60, type species *Coluber irregularis* Merrem *in* Bechstein, 1802, p. 239 by subsequent designation of Cope, 1860, p. 264) was overlooked by all eighteenth century authors (with the single exception of Cope) until Stejneger, 1902, p. 15, pointed out that it was a senior subjective synonym of *Dipsadomorphus* Fitzinger (1843, p. 27, type species by original designation *Coluber trigonatus* Schneider *in* Bechstein, 1802, p. 156).

2. For the next twenty years Stejneger's observation was largely ignored, but since 1922 *Boiga* has been in constant use, *Dipsadomorphus* being used almost exclusively by those few authors who believed the two genera to be distinct. In fact, during the last 50 years *Dipsadomorphus* has appeared in the primary zoological literature as a valid name only once, whereas *Boiga* has been used in over 175 scientific publications including the important faunal lists and taxonomic revisions of Pope, 1935, p. 327; Bourret, 1936, p. 308; Bogert, 1940, p. 60; Smith, 1943, p. 344; Tweedie, 1954, p. 74; Kuntz, 1963, p. 49; Taylor, 1965, p. 865; Worrell, 1965, p. 104; Underwood, 1967, p. 111; Pitman, 1974, p. 124; Villiers, 1975, p. 127; Cogger, 1979, p. 364 and Rasmussen, 1979, p. 97.

3. *Ibiba* Gray (1825, p. 209), type species by monotypy *Coluber irregularis* Merrem *in* Bechstein, 1802, p. 239) is a senior objective synonym of *Boiga*. To the best of our knowledge the name *Ibiba* has not been used as a senior synonym since its original description.

4. Strict application of the Law of Priority would result in the well-established name *Boiga* being replaced by the virtually unknown *Ibiba*.

5. To prevent this undesirable nomenclatural change the Commission is requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Ibiba* Gray, 1825 for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Boiga* Fitzinger, 1826 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation *Coluber irregularis* Merrem *in* Bechstein 1802, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *irregularis* Merrem *in* Bechstein, 1802, as published in the binomen *Coluber irregularis* (specific name of type species of *Boiga* Fitzinger, 1826) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Ibiba* Gray, 1825, as suppressed in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BECHSTEIN, J. M. 1802. *Herrn de la Cepède's Naturgeschichte der Amphibien, oder eyerlegenden vierfüssigen Thiere und der Schlangen. Fortsetzung von Buffon's Naturgeschichte. Aus dem französischen übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen und Zusätzen versehen.* Weimar. Vol. 4. xx+298 pp.

BOGERT, C. M. 1940. Herpetological results of the Vernay Angola Expedition. *Bull. Am. Mus. nat. Hist.* vol. 77, pp. 1–107.

BOURRET, R. 1936. *Les serpents de l'Indochine.* Toulouse. Vol. 2. 505 pp.

COGGER, H. G. 1979. *Reptiles and amphibians of Australia.* Revised edition. Sydney, Wellington and London. 608 pp.

COPE, E. D. 1860. Catalogue of the Colubridae in the Museum of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, with notes and descriptions of new species. Part 2. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.*, pp. 241–266.

FITZINGER, L. 1826. *Neue Classification der Reptilien nach ihren natürlichen Verwandtschaften.* Vienna, 66 pp.

——1843. *Systema Reptilium.* Vienna. 106+vi pp.

GRAY, J. E. 1825. A synopsis of the genera of reptiles and amphibia, with a description of some new species. *Ann. Phil.*, vol. 10, pp. 193–217.

KUNTZ, R. E. 1963. *Snakes of Taiwan.* Taipei. 80 pp.

PITMAN, C. R. S. 1974. *A guide to the snakes of Uganda.* Revised edition. Codicote. 290 pp.

POPE, C. H. 1935. The reptiles of China. *Natural History of Central Asia.* New York. Vol. 10. 604 pp.

RASMUSSEN, J. B. 1979. An intergeneric analysis of some boigine snakes—Bogert's (1940) group XIII and XIV (Boiginae, Serpentes). *Vidensk. Meddr. dansk naturh. Foren.*, vol. 141, pp. 97–155.

SMITH, M. A. 1943. *The fauna of British India, Ceylon and Burma, including the whole of the Indo-Chinese sub-region. Reptilia and Amphibia.* London. Vol. 3. Serpentes. xii+583 pp.

STEJNEGER, L. 1902. A new opisthoglyph snake from Formosa. *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.*, vol. 15, pp. 15–17.

TAYLOR, E. H. 1965. The serpents of Thailand and adjacent waters. *Univ. Kans. Sci. Bull.*, vol. 45, pp. 609–1096.

TWEEDIE, M. W. F. 1954. *The snakes of Malaya.* Singapore. 139 pp.

UNDERWOOD, G. L. 1967. *A contribution to the classification of snakes.* London. 179 pp.

VILLIERS, A. 1975. Les serpents de l'Ouest africain. *Init. afr.*, vol. 2 (3rd edition). 195 pp.

WORRELL, E. 1963. *Reptiles of Australia.* Sydney, London, Melbourne and Wellington. 207 pp.

GLOSSODORIS EHRENBERG, 1831, *HYPSELODORIS* STIMPSON, 1855 AND *CHROMODORIS* ALDER & HANCOCK, 1855 (GASTROPODA, OPISTHOBRANCHIA): PROPOSED CLARIFICATION AND CONSERVATION. Z.N.(S.)2432

By W. B. Rudman (*Australian Museum, P.O. Box A285, Sydney South, N.S.W., Australia 2000*)

The purpose of the present application is to clarify and conserve certain genus-group names in the CHROMODORIDIDAE (Gastropoda, Opisthobranchia) by the suppression under the plenary powers of *Actinodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831 and *Pterodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831.

2. In 1831 Ehrenberg erected three new subgenera of *Doris* Linnaeus and distinguished them on gill morphology. Within these three subgenera he described five new species on the basis of shape and coloration as follows:

Subgenus *Glossodoris*, sign. *f*
Doris xantholeuca, sign. *f*
Doris erythraea, sign. *f*
Subgenus *Actinodoris*, sign. *g*
Doris sponsa, sign. *g*
Subgenus *Pterodoris*, sign. *g*
Doris picturata, sign. *g*
Doris brachyphylla, sign. *g*

No illustrations and no information on the internal anatomy were included and no investigation of the type material has been undertaken until recently (Rudman, 1983) to correctly identify these species, all from the Red Sea.

3. In 1847, p. 164, Gray designated *D. xantholeuca* as type species of *Glossodoris* and *D. picturata* as type species of *Pterodoris*. *D. sponsa* is the type species of *Actinodoris* by monotypy.

4. In 1855 Stimpson, pp. 388, 389, conditionally erected the genus *Hypselodoris* for *Goniodoris? obscura* Stimpson, 1855, p. 388, which became the type species of the genus by monotypy.

5. Also in 1855, Appendix, p. xvii, Alder & Hancock erected the genus *Chromodoris* with *Doris magnifica* Quoy & Gaimard, 1832, p. 270 as the type species by monotypy.

6. All these genera belong to one family, the CHROMODORIDIDAE, erected by Bergh, 1892, p. 1103, the most prolific worker on opisthobranch taxonomy in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Apart from a few aberrant species he considered all the species in the family to belong to one genus for which he used the name *Chromodoris* (Bergh, 1875, 1878). When he became aware of Ehrenberg's names he studied Ehrenberg's types (Bergh, 1877), but only externally, and rejected the names: 'I have shown that the genera *Glossodoris*, *Actinodoris*, and *Pterodoris*, established by Ehrenberg in 1831 should be dropped, being founded on non-essential and inconstant characters of

the branchial leaflets... The name given by Alder and Hancock (*Chromodoris*) must be conserved for this genus' (Bergh, 1879, p. 108). He repeated this sentiment later (1884, pp. 64–65). In all of his later work in which he described over 50 species of *Chromodoris* s.l. and recorded over 100 species, Bergh used the name *Chromodoris.*

7. Sir Charles Eliot, a contemporary of Bergh's, also used *Chromodoris* but felt that the contained species should perhaps be split into a number of genera (Eliot, 1904, pp. 382–386) but 'I have not done so out of deference to the high authority of Professor Bergh'.

8. O'Donoghue, 1924, pp. 553–554, discussed the history of the names and stated: 'Thus in spite of the common usage of the generic designation *Chromodoris,* there is no doubt that Ehrenberg's names have considerable priority. The question as to which name should be employed is easily settled, for while they were published at the same time, *Glossodoris* comes first in order, and the first species is given as *G. xantholeuca,* which Gray designated as type species. Bergh, in a paper where he re-examines Ehrenberg's types, states, in our opinion rightly, that *G. xantholeuca* is *D. pallida* Rüppell & Leuckart, and that all species of *Glossodoris* are congeneric. The genus then stands as *Glossodoris* with the type species *G. pallida* (Rüpp. et Leuckart)'. (O'Donoghue in this paper acted as first reviser under Article 24 as between Ehrenberg's three subgeneric names; but this is irrelevant in terms of today's taxonomy, as will emerge below.) If all these species are congeneric, then O'Donoghue is correct in taxonomic terms but his paper illustrates the causes of further confusion that followed. Although Bergh did examine the external features of the preserved specimen of *D. xantholeuca* there was no external character that he could use to equate that species with *D. pallida* of Rüppell & Leuckart, 1830 or 1831, p. 33, pl. 10, fig. 1.

9. Odhner, 1931, pp. 30–35, considered that there were two distinct radula types within the *'Chromodoris-Glossodoris'* genus group and proposed splitting the group into two genera. Based on two species available to him he decided that two genera could be established:

(a) with hamate teeth, the innermost one denticulate on both margins, the others serrate on their external edge only;
(b) with bicuspid teeth.

However, at that time, no information was available on the type of radula possessed by *Chromodoris magnifica* and *Glossodoris xantholeuca,* the type species of their respective genera. Eliot, 1904, pp. 385, 397, reported that a species he tentatively identified as *C. magnifica* (but which is quite different in colour) had bicuspid teeth. Odhner, on the basis of Eliot's tentative identification, placed the one of his two species with bicuspid teeth—*C. valenciennesi* (Cantraine, 1841)—in *Chromodoris.* He retained *Glossodoris* for *C. punctilucens* Bergh, 1890, in which the teeth are hamate and denticulate, simply on the basis that this second type of radular morphology needed a genus-group name.

10. In 1934 Pruvot-Fol examined the type of *Doris magnifica* and found that the teeth are hamate and denticulate. Both Pruvot-Fol and Odhner (1957, in admitting his 1931 error) considered that Eliot had misinterpreted a statement of Alder & Hancock (1864, p. 123) concerning the radula of *C. magnifica* and talk of 'the error of Eliot'. Here is perhaps an appropriate place to correct the record. Eliot made no error in describing the bifid radula of the species he tentatively identified as *C. magnifica*. We now know that the species he was describing was not *C. magnifica*—and he specifically stated that 'identification [with *C. magnifica*] is uncertain in the absence of information as to the radula of that species'. The error, then, was of Odhner, not Eliot, and Odhner's 'clarification' (1931) only confused the situation further.

11. Winckworth, 1946, considered that *Glossodoris* should be used for those species with hamate and denticulate teeth, with *'Actinodoris* and its exact synonym *Chromodoris* belonging to the same group'. He considered that *Pterodoris* could be used for forms with bicuspid teeth with *Hypselodoris* as a synonym. This decision was based on unfounded synonymies of Ehrenberg's species with other species of which the radular morphology was known. At that time, although the radular morphology of *Chromodoris magnifica* and *Hypselodoris obscura,* the type species of their respective genera, was known, that of all Ehrenberg's species was not.

12. During the same period Baba, 1949, considered all species with these two radular morphologies to be *Glossodoris* and Pruvot-Fol, 1951, in a work listing all described species of this group, placed them all in *Glossodoris.*

13. Odhner, 1957, pp. 250–253, recognised his earlier error and considered that *Chromodoris* should be used for all species with hamate and denticulate teeth and *Hypselodoris* for species with bicuspid teeth. He stated that: *'Glossodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831, should be abandoned as unsettled.' In a footnote to that paper Odhner reported that he had discovered the whereabouts of Ehrenberg's types and 'as soon as possible I shall report on this'. He did not report on the types before his death.

14. Since that time some workers have continued to use *Glossodoris* for both groups of species but most workers have followed Odhner in using *Chromodoris* for species with hamate and denticulate and *Hypselodoris* for species with bicuspid teeth. All major workers on the family since that date, including Bouchet, Bertsch, Edmunds, Kay & Young, Marcus & Marcus, Rudman and Thompson have followed this usage (see Appendix 2). It should be noted that the 100-year debate on Ehrenberg's names has been based totally on conjecture and supposition and a total lack of evidence concerning the identity and anatomy of Ehrenberg's species. It is also important to realise that the debate has mainly centred around the use of the names *Glossodoris, Chromodoris* and *Hypselodoris.* Apart from Winckworth, 1946, the names *Actinodoris* and *Pterodoris* have not been seriously considered (see Appendix

1). A summary of the usage of generic names as reviewed in paragraphs 1 to 14 is presented in Appendix 3.

15. In preparing a revision of the CHROMODORIDIDAE I have obtained from the Zoological Museum, Berlin, Ehrenberg's types of *Glossodoris xantholeuca, Actinodoris sponsa* and *Pterodoris picturata.* The material is not suitable for detailed anatomical studies but radula mounts were made (Rudman, 1983) and the following conclusions reached:

(a) *Glossodoris xantholeuca,* with hamate and denticulate teeth, is identical with *Doris pallida* Rüppell & Leuckart, 1830 or 1831, and this latter name is older. The radular teeth are hamate and denticulate but differ from those of *Chromodoris* in having numerous fine denticles rather than a few coarse ones, and in having a very narrow radular ribbon in which the number of teeth in a transverse row is approximately one-half the number of rows of teeth in the ribbon, whereas in a comparable species of *Chromodoris* the number of teeth in a row would be approximately twice the number of rows. From my studies of further specimens of *Glossodoris pallida* from East Africa and the Red Sea, this species belongs to a genus within the CHROMODORIDIDAE distinct from *Chromodoris* and *Hypselodoris.* Junior synonyms would include *Casella* H. & A. Adams, 1854 (type species *C. gouldi* H. & A. Adams, 1854), *Doriprismatica* d'Orbigny, 1839 (type species *Doris atromarginata* Cuvier, 1804) and *Chromolaichma* Bertsch, 1977 (type species *Casella sedna* Marcus & Marcus, 1967).

(b) *Actinodoris sponsa* has hamate and denticulate teeth, typical of *Chromodoris.* It has traces of white and black lines on the dorsum of the holotype. It has usually been considered a synonym of *Doris quadricolor* Rüppell & Leuckart, 1830 or 1831, but the detailed radular morphology is quite different (Rudman, 1977, 1982). As I have discussed in those two papers, there are a number of distinct but similarly coloured species. From the original description and the radula, it is not possible to identify *A. sponsa* confidently with any known species.

(c) *Pterodoris picturata* has bicuspid radular teeth typical of the genus *Hypselodoris.* It also has distinctive epithelial mantle glands posteriorly, another characteristic of the genus. It has been considered a synonym of *Doris infucata* Rüppell & Leuckart, 1830 or 1831, but as with the preceding species there is a group of similarly coloured species and the radula is not distinctive enough to identify the species positively. At this point Ehrenberg's other two species should be considered. No specimens of *Glossodoris erythraea* exist (Bergh,

1877) and *Pterodoris brachyphylla* cannot be recognised from the brief description.

16. If the Law of Priority is followed, then (a) *Glossodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831 (type species *G. xantholeuca*=*D. pallida* Rüppell & Leuckart, 1830 or 1831) is retained with *Casella, Doriprismatica* and *Chromolaichma* as junior synonyms. Although *Casella* has usually been used for this genus, its replacement by *Glossodoris* would not greatly upset modern usage because the genus is small and not often mentioned in the literature. Also the type species of *Casella, C. gouldi* (by monotypy), is based on a colour illustration and the species has never been found since. Many modern authors (e.g. Thompson, 1972; Bertsch, 1977) consider *Doris atromarginata* Cuvier to be the type species, but this cannot be so since it was not originally included in the genus. The conclusion appears in any case to be based on an unfounded decision of Bergh's (1888, p. 838) to synonymise the two names. The latter species is well known and differs considerably in colour and external form from the illustration of *C. gouldi. Casella,* then, is based on a type species of which we have no anatomical information and that has not been rediscovered since its original description. (b) *Actinodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831 (type species *A. sponsa*) would replace *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855. This would greatly upset the usage of the last twenty years which has stabilised after forty years of confusion. It would also mean replacing a name in use for over 100 years and one on which the family name is based by one that has seldom been used and is based on a species which, although recognisable at the generic level, is unrecognisable at the specific level. (c) *Pterodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831 (type species *P. picturata*) would replace *Hypselodoris* Stimpson, 1855. As with the previous case, this would greatly upset present usage and again the name of a genus with a well known type species would be replaced by the name of a genus based on a type species that is unrecognisable at the specific level.

17. I therefore request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic names (a) *Actinodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831 and (b) *Pterodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the following names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Glossodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Gray, 1847, *Doris* (*Glossodoris*) *xantholeuca* Ehrenberg, 1831;
   (b) *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855 (gender: feminine), type species by monotypy, *Doris magnifica* Quoy & Gaimard, 1832;
   (c) *Hypselodoris* Stimpson, 1855 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotopy, *Goniodoris*? *obscura* Stimpson, 1855;

(3) to place the following names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *pallida* Rüppell & Leuckart, 1830 or 1831, as published in the binomen *Doris pallida* (the valid name at the time of this application of the type species of *Glossodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831);
   (b) *magnifica* Quoy & Gaimard, 1832, as published in the binomen *Doris magnifica* (specific name of type species of *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855);
   (c) *obscura* Stimpson, 1855, as published in the binomen *Goniodoris? obscura* (specific name of type species of *Hypselodoris* Stimpson, 1855);
(4) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology the name CHROMODORIDIDAE Bergh, 1892 (type genus *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855);
(5) to place the following names, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Actinodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831;
   (b) *Pterodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831.

Appendix 1

Usage of names *Actinodoris* and *Pterodoris*

Apart from the discussions of Bergh (1877, 1879, 1884) and Winckworth (1946), already mentioned in the preceding submission, the names *Actinodoris* and *Pterodoris* have seldom been used in the literature. Listed below are all other primary uses of the names by early workers, mainly in uncritical generic compilations.

1. GRAY, J. E., 1847
   (a) designates *D. xantholeuca* as type of *Glossodoris*
   (b) designates *D. picturata* as type of *Pterodoris*
   (c) lists *D. sponsa* as type of *Actinodoris*
2. ADAMS, H. & ADAMS, A., 1854
   (a) The 'type of the genus *Actinodoris'* is given incorrectly as *Doris flammulata* Quoy & Gaimard, a species which belongs to the genus *Hexabranchus*. Fourteen species are listed in the genus including all those mentioned by Gray (1857) and including also *D. sponsa* but not as type species.
   (b) *Glossodoris* is incorrectly typified as having a tuberculate mantle, leading to the error of Gray (1857) and *G. bertheloti* d'Orbigny, which is not a chromodorid, is given as a typical example. The seven species listed include *D. picturata* (the type of *Pterodoris*) and *D. xantholeuca* (the type of *Glossodoris*), but *Doris pallida* Rüppell & Leuckart (a senior synonym of *D. xantholeuca*) is listed in the separate genus *Doriprismatica*.

3. GRAY, J. E., 1857
   (a) under *Glossodoris*, he lists three species with tuberculate mantles, none of which are chromodorids.
   (b) under *Actinodoris*, he lists eleven species, none of which are chromodorids, and which today would be placed in a number of genera including *Hexabranchus, Discodoris, Platydoris* and *Dendrodoris*.
4. ANGAS, G. F., 1864
   (a) Uses the genus *Actinodoris* for a new species *Actinodoris australis*, which is most probably a species of *Dendrodoris*. No explanation of the use of the name *Actinodoris* is given.
5. ABRAHAM, P. S., 1877
   (a) The genus *Chromodoris* is listed with *Doriprismatica*, d'Orbigny; *Goniodoris*, Gray (in part); *Goniobranchus* Pease and *Hemidoris* Stimpson as synonyms. Ehrenberg's *D. xantholeuca* and *D. erythraea* are considered to belong to *Chromodoris* and *D. brachyphylla, D. picturata* and *D. sponsa* as tentatively belonging to that genus. Ehrenberg's generic names *Glossodoris, Actinodoris* and *Pterodoris* are ignored although the three type species are listed under *Chromodoris*.
6. TRYON, G. W., 1883
   (a) *Chromodoris* is listed (p. 370) with Abraham's (1877) generic synonyms, but Ehrenberg's names are ignored.
7. THIELE, J., 1931
   (a) *Glossodoris* is listed with *Actinodoris, Pterodoris, Chromodoris* and *Goniobranchus* as synonyms.

Appendix 2

Usage of names *Chromodoris, Hypselodoris, Glossodoris, Casella*

As an indication of modern usage of the names under consideration the opisthobranch literature of the last twenty years (1962–1982) was searched. In 85 papers by 35 authors in which species belonging to the Chromodorididae were included:

Chromodoris was used in 59 papers,
Hypselodoris was used in 54 papers,
Glossodoris was used in 14 papers,
Casella was used in 12 papers.

(a) All uses of *Chromodoris* and *Hypselodoris* followed Odhner's (1957) definition of the two genera and in the usage this submission hopes to stabilise.

(b) 13 usages of *Glossodoris*, followed Pruvot-Fol (1951) and Baba (1949), in using it as a broad generic concept including both *Chromodoris* and *Hypselodoris*. This usage was restricted to two authors from Japan and China and three authors from the Atlantic and Mediterranean coasts of Europe.

(c) One use of *Glossodoris* is inconsistent with any usage (Abbott, 1974). *Glossodoris* is considered a senior synonym of *Chromodoris*, and *Hypselodoris* to be a subgenus. The type of *Glossodoris* is incorrectly identified as *Doris gracilis* Rapp, 1827.

(d) In all but one case, *Casella* is used in conjunction with one species, *Casella atromarginata* (Cuvier, 1804).

Appendix 3
Usage of generic names as outlined in paragraphs 1–14

Ehrenberg, 1831	*Glossodoris*	*Actinodoris*	*Pterodoris*
H. & A. Adams, 1854	*Casella*	—	—
Stimpson, 1855	—	—	*Hypselodoris*
Alder & Hancock, 1855	—	*Chromodoris*	—
Bergh (many papers)[1]	*Casella*	*Chromodoris*	
O'Donoghue, 1924[2]	—	*Glossodoris*	
Odhner, 1931[3]	—	*Glossodoris?*	*Chromodoris*
Winckworth, 1946[4]	—	*Glossodoris*	*Pterodoris*
Baba, 1949[5]	*Casella*	*Glossodoris*	
Pruvot-Fol, 1951[5]	—	*Glossodoris*	
Odhner, 1957[6]	—	*Chromodoris*	*Hypselodoris*
This proposal	*Glossodoris*	*Chromodoris*	*Hypselodoris*

Notes:
1. *Chromodoris* = *Glossodoris, Pterodoris, Actinodoris, Hypselodoris.*
2. *Glossodoris* = *Pterodoris, Actinodoris, Chromodoris.*
3. Odhner incorrectly assumed that the *Hypselodoris* radula morphology was typical of *Chromodoris* and that hamate and denticulate radular morphology was typical of *Glossodoris.* Although the species he had available was by chance a true *Glossodoris* his 1957 'correction' showed that his placement of it in *Glossodoris* was a guess.
4. *Glossodoris* = *Actinodoris, Chromodoris. Pterodoris* = *Hypselodoris.*
5. *Glossodoris* = *Actinodoris, Chromodoris, Pterodoris, Hypselodoris.*
6. Reversed his earlier decision and considered *Glossodoris* should not be used until understood anatomically. The names as used by Odhner (1957) have been accepted usage by most subsequent authors (Appendix 2).

REFERENCES

ABBOTT, R. T. 1974. *American seashells.* New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold.

ABRAHAM, P. S. 1877. A revision of the anthobranchiate nudibranchiate Mollusca, with descriptions of forty-one hitherto undescribed species. *Proc. zool. Soc. London* for 1877, pp. 196–267.

ADAMS, H. & ADAMS, A. 1854. *The genera of the recent Mollusca,* vol. 2, part XVII, pp. 29–60. London, Van Voorst.

ALDER, J. & HANCOCK, A. 1855. *Monograph of the British nudibranchiate Mollusca,* Appendix. London, Ray Society.

—— & ——1864. Notice of a collection of nudibranch Mollusca made in India by Walter Elliot, Esq. *Trans. zool. Soc. London,* vol. 5, pp. 113–147.

ANGAS, G. F. 1864. Description d'espèces nouvelles ... mollusques nudibranches des environs de Port Jackson (Nouvelles-Galles du Sud). *J. Conchyliol.,* (3) vol. 12, pp. 43–70.

BABA, K. 1949. *Opisthobranchia of Sagami Bay.* Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten.

BERGH, R. 1875. Neue Nacktschnecken der Südsee, 3. *J. Mus. Godeffroy*, vol. 3 (8), pp. 72–78.

—— 1877. Kritische Untersuchung der Ehrenberg'schen Doriden. *Jahrb. deutsch. malakoozool. Gesellschaft*, vol. 4, pp. 45–76.

——1878. Neue Nacktschnecken der Südsee, 4. *J. Mus. Godeffroy*, vol. 5(14), pp. 1–3.

——1879. On the nudibranchiate gasteropod Mollusca of the north Pacific Ocean, with special reference to those of Alaska, part 1. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia* for 1879, pp. 108–109.

——1884. Report on the Nudibranchiata. *Challenger Reports* (Zool.), vol. 10 (26), pp. 64–72.

——1889. Malacologische Untersuchungen, in *Reisen im Archipel der Philippinen von Dr C. Semper*, Sect. 2, vol. 3(16), p. 838.

——1892. Malacologische Untersuchungen, in *Reisen im Archipel der Philippinen von Dr C. Semper*, Sect. 2, vol. 3(18), p. 1103.

BERTSCH, H. 1977. The Chromodoridinae nudibranchs from the Pacific coast of America, part 1. *Veliger*, vol. 20, p. 113.

EHRENBERG, C. G. 1831. *Symbolae physicae seu icones et descriptiones animalium evertebratorum sepositis insectis quae ex itinere per Africam borealem et Asiam occidentalem.* Decas 1, Mollusca.

ELIOT, C. N. E. 1904. On some nudibranchs from East Africa and Zanzibar, part 3. *Proc. zool. Soc. London*, vol. 1 for 1904, pp. 382–386.

GRAY, J. E. 1847. A list of the genera of Recent Mollusca, their synonyma and types. *Proc. zool. Soc. London* for 1847, pp. 164–168.

——1857. *Guide to the systematic distribution of Mollusca in the British Museum*, Part 1, pp. 208–212. London, Taylor & Francis.

ODHNER, N. H. 1931. Beiträge zur malakozoologie der Kanarischen Inseln. *Arkiv för Zoologi*, vol. 23, pp. 1–116.

——1957. *Chromodoris* contra *Glossodoris*, a systematic nomenclatorial controversy. *Proc. malacol. Soc. London*, vol. 32, pp. 250–253.

O'DONOGHUE, C. H. 1924. Report on Opisthobranchia from Abrolhos Is., Western Australia, with description of a new parasitic copepod. *J. linn. Soc. London*, vol. 35, pp. 553–554.

ORBIGNY, A. D' 1839. Mollusques, échinodermes, foraminifères et polypiers, recueillies aux Iles Canaries par MM. Webb et Berthelot et décrits par Alcide d'Orbigny. *Hist. nat. Iles Canaries*, vol. 2, part 2, Mollusca 5, pp. 39–40.

PRUVOT-FOL, A. 1934. Les opisthobranches de Quoy & Gaimard. *Arch. Mus. Hist. nat. Lyon*, vol. 11(6), pp. 13–89.

——1951. Révision du genre *Glossodoris* Ehrenberg. *J. Conchyliol.*, vol. 91, pp. 76–164.

QUOY, J. R. C. & GAIMARD, J. C. 1832. *in Voyage de l'Astrolabe*, Zool., vol. 2, Mollusques, p. 270.

RUDMAN, W. B. 1977. Chromodorid opisthobranch Mollusca from East Africa and the tropical West Pacific. *Zool. J. linn. Soc. London*, vol. 61, pp. 351–397.

——1982. The Chromodorididae (Opisthobranchia, Mollusca) of the Indo West Pacific: *Chromodoris quadricolor, C. lineolata* and *Hypselodoris nigrolineata* colour groups. *Zool. J. linn. Soc. London*, vol. 76, pp. 183–241.

——1983. The Chromodorididae (Opisthobranchia, Mollusca) of the Indo West Pacific: a revision of the genera. *Zool. J. linn. Soc. London.* (In press).

RÜPPELL, E. & LEUCKART, F. S. 1830 or 1831. Neue wirbellose Thiere des rothen Meeres, in Rüppell, E., *Atlas zu der Reise im nördlichen Afrika*, p. 33, pl. 10, fig. 1.

STIMPSON, W. 1855. Descriptions of some new marine invertebrates. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, vol. 7 (10), pp. 388–389.

THIELE, J. 1931. *Handbuch der systematischen Weichtierkunde*, p. 431. Jena, Fischer.

TRYON, G. W. 1883. *Structural and systematic conchology*, vol. 2, p. 370. Philadelphia, Tryon.

THOMPSON, T. E. 1972. Chromodorid nudibranchs from eastern Australia (Gastropoda, Opisthobranchia). *J. Zool.*, vol. 166, pp. 391–409.

WINCKWORTH, R. 1946. Synonyms of *Glossodoris*. *Proc. malacol. Soc. London*, vol. 26, pp. 153–154.

Comments on the above Application

Dr Rudman's application is supported by Dr Malcolm Edmunds (*Preston Polytechnic, Preston, U.K.*), Dr Hans Bertsch (*Instituto de Investigaciones Oceanologicas, Universidad Autonoma de Baja California, Mexico*), Dr P. Bouchet (*Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, France*), Dr Eveline Marcus (*Department of Zoology, University of São Paulo, Brazil*), Dr M. C. Miller (*Department of Zoology, University of Auckland, New Zealand*) and Dr Bernard E. Picton (*Ulster Museum, Belfast, U.K.*). Dr Edmunds fears that the replacement of *Casella* by *Glossodoris* following the Law of Priority could cause some confusion, but favours Dr Rudman's proposal because the type species of *Casella* remains unknown and would require redesignation. Dr Marcus looks forward to the removal of the confusion of over 100 years. All are in favour of the suppression of *Actinodoris* and *Pterodoris*.

R.V.M.

RHINOCLAMA DALL & SMITH, 1886 (MOLLUSCA, SEPTIBRANCHIA): PROPOSED VALIDATION OF THE CUSTOMARY USAGE. Z.N.(S.)2151

By David Heppell (*Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh*) and Rhona E. Morgan (*University Marine Biological Station, Millport, Isle of Cumbrae, Scotland*)

Adams (1864, p. 207) in his list of the Japanese species of *Neaera* [=*Cuspidaria*] established the new subgenus *Rhinomya.* He provided a short, but diagnostic, description and included two species, *R. philippinensis* Hinds and *R. rugata* Adams. The generic name was twice preoccupied, first in Diptera and then in Birds.

2. Adams recorded the first species from two localities, Kino-O-Sima, 25 fathoms, and Uraga, 21 fathoms. Specimens of Adams's original material from Uraga are in the collections of the British Museum (Natural History), reg. no. 1878.1.28.416. Adams identified this species with *Neaera philippinensis* Hinds, 1843, but provided no further description.

3. A short description was given for *R. rugata* but the species has not subsequently been recognised from Japan. A specimen from Port Jackson, identified as this species, is in the British Museum (Natural History) but the species is not recorded in Iredale & McMichael's (1962) check-list of the marine Mollusca of New South Wales.

4. Smith (1885, p. 37) subdivided *Neaera* into 'sections'. His section G is equivalent to *Rhinomya* Adams and included only *N. rugata* Adams and '*N. philippinensis* A. Adams (nec Hinds)'. *N. philippinensis* Hinds is the sole included species in Smith's section H. Smith did not provide descriptions of these species. He indicated that he had not seen specimens of *N. rugata,* from which we may conclude that Adams's types of that species were not in the British Museum at that time; their present whereabouts is unknown. Smith's separation of '*N. philippinensis* Adams' from *N. philippinensis* Hinds must have been based on the evidence of the specimens in the British Museum. He logically, though invalidly, associated Adams's name *Rhinomya* with the specimens Adams had misidentified with Hinds's species.

5. Dall & Smith in Dall (1886, p. 300) proposed *Rhinoclama* as a new section of the subgenus *Leiomya.* As they synonymised *Rhinoclama* with *Rhinomya* Adams non [Robineau-] Desvoidy nec Geoffroy, and with sections F and G of Smith, it must be considered that *Rhinoclama* was validly proposed as a replacement name for the preoccupied *Rhinomya.* Dall & Smith cite as type species '*N. philippinensis* (A. Adams) E. A. Smith'. As shown in paragraph 4 above, Smith's use of this name to represent a taxon distinct from Hinds's species of the same name was based only on specimens, not on a description. As a nomen nudum it is unacceptable for a type species.

6. Stoliczka (1871, p. xv), presumably unaware of Adams's misidentification, had already validly designated *N. phillipinensis* [sic] Hinds as type of *Rhinomya*. This designation is upheld by Keen in Moore (1969, p. N854). If accepted this would have the effect of transferring the applicability of the name *Rhinoclama* from Smith's section G to his section H. *Luzonia* Dall & Smith in Dall, 1890, would become a junior objective synonym of *Rhinoclama* Dall & Smith in Dall, 1886 (quite contrary to those authors' intentions when establishing these taxa as separate subgenera), and leaving *Rhinoclama* auctt. without a name. Keen's action in accepting the taxonomic consequences of Stoliczka's type designation has already confused at least one subsequent author. Habe (1977, p. 322), in contrast to his earlier synonymy of 1952 (see next paragraph), synonymised *Luzonia* with *Rhinoclama* but included in that genus only '*Rh. adamsi* Thiele, 1934' (with 'synonym' *Neaera philippinensis* Hinds non A. Adams!) and '*Rh. rugata* (A. Adams, 1868) [sic] (nom. oblitum)'.

7. Although it is clear under the Code that *N. philippinensis* Adams has no nomenclatural status other than as a usage of *N. philippinensis* Hinds and that, as the latter is type by subsequent designation of *Rhinomya* [=*Rhinoclama*] and type by original designation of *Luzonia*, those genus-group names cannot be other than objective synonyms, it is evident that this interpretation is not in accordance with general usage. Apart from Stoliczka and Keen, the usage of *Rhinomya* or *Rhinoclama* has consistently been in the sense of Adams's misidentified and undescribed specimens in the British Museum (Natural History). For instance, Prashad (1932, p. 328, footnote) states: 'with the authors of the subgenus, I have given *C.* (*R.*) *philippinensis* as its type, but this species has never been described, and I have not seen any specimens of it.' Thiele (1934, p. 948), aware that the subgenera *Luzonia* and *Rhinoclama* both had the same nominal species as type, proposed the new name *Cuspidaria adamsi* for *philippinensis* Adams non Hinds. As this was not accompanied by any description, this is, unfortunately, just as much a nomen nudum (in the sense of a name not available for the material associated with it) as the original name. Kuroda & Habe (1952, p. 18) cited the species as '*adamsi* Thiele' [their quotes] in their check list of recent marine Mollusca of Japan, while Habe (1952, p. 276) listed '*Rhinoclama adamsi* (Thiele) (nomen nudum)', and gave as a synonym '*Neaera philippinensis* (A. Adams, 1864) Smith, 1885 (name only), non Hinds, 1843'. This species was described for the first time by Morgan & Heppell, 1981, in an Appendix to Allen & Morgan (1981, p. 546). As no purpose would have been served by substituting any other name, the specific name *adamsi* was retained; the species is believed to be distinct from all other published nominal species.

8. In order to set aside the type-designation of *Neaera philippinensis* Hinds by Stoliczka, 1871, it is proposed that the plenary powers be used to designate *Cuspidaria* (*Rhinoclama*) *adamsi* Morgan

& Heppell, 1981, based on a specimen in the British Museum (Natural History) misidentified by Adams as *Neaera philippinensis* Hinds, as type species of *Rhinoclama* Dall & Smith in Dall, 1886.

9. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use the plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for *Rhinoclama* Dall & Smith in Dall, 1886, and to designate *Cuspidaria* (*Rhinoclama*) *adamsi* Morgan & Heppell, 1981, as type species of that genus-group taxon;

(2) to place the following genus-group names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Rhinoclama* Dall & Smith in Dall, 1886 (gender: feminine), type species by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above: *Cuspidaria* (*Rhinoclama*) *adamsi* Morgan & Heppell, 1981;

(b) *Luzonia* Dall & Smith in Dall, 1890 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation: *Neaera philippinensis* Hinds, 1843:

(3) to place the following species-group names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *adamsi* Morgan & Heppell, 1981, as published in the binomen *Cuspidaria* (*Rhinoclama*) *adamsi* (specific name of type species of *Rhinoclama* Dall & Smith in Dall, 1886);

(b) *philippinensis* Hinds, 1843, as published in the binomen *Neaera philippinensis* (specific name of type species of *Luzonia* Dall & Smith in Dall, 1890);

(4) to place the species-group name *adamsi* Thiele, 1934, as published in the binomen *Cuspidaria adamsi* (a nomen nudum), on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

ADAMS, A. 1864. On the species of *Neaera* found in the seas of Japan. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (3), vol. 13, pp. 206–209.

ALLEN, J. A. & MORGAN, R. E. 1981. The functional morphology of Atlantic deep water species of the families Cuspidariidae and Poromyidae (Bivalvia): an analysis of the evolution of the septibranch condition. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.*, (B), vol. 294, pp. 413–546.

DALL, W. H. & SMITH, E. A. *in*-DALL, W. H. 1886. Reports on the results of dredging ... by the U.S. coast survey steamer 'Blake' ... XXIX.—Report on the Mollusca. Part I. Brachiopoda and Pelecypoda. *Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. Harv.*, vol. 12, pp. 171–318.

——1890. Scientific results of explorations by the U.S. Fish Commission steamer 'Albatross'. VII. Preliminary report on the collection of Mollusca and Brachiopoda obtained in 1887–1888. *Proc. U.S. natn. Mus.*, vol. 12, pp. 219–362.

HABE, T. 1952. *Genera of Japanese Shells.* Pelecypoda No. 3, pp. 187–278.
——1977. *Systematics of Mollusca in Japan: Bivalvia and Scaphopoda.*
HINDS, R. B. 1843. Descriptions of new species of *Neaera*, from the collection of Sir Edward Belcher, C.B., made during a voyage round the world, and from that of Hugh Cuming, Esq., obtained during his visit to the Philippines; with notices of the synonymy. *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* (11), pp. 75–79.
IREDALE, T. & McMICHAEL, D. F. 1962. A reference list of the marine Mollusca of New South Wales. *Mem. Aust. Mus.*, vol. 11.
KEEN, A. M. *in* MOORE, R. B. (ed.). 1969. Superfamily Poromyacea Dall, 1886. *Treatise on invertebrate Paleontology* N (Mollusca 6: Bivalvia).
KURODA, T. & HABE, T. 1952. *Check list and bibliography of the recent marine Mollusca of Japan.* Tokyo.
PRASHAD, B. 1932. The Lamellibranchia of the Siboga Expedition. *Siboga-Exped.*, vol. 34. Mollusca D. Lief. 53c.
SMITH, E. A. 1885. Report on the Lamellibranchiata collected by H.M.S. Challenger. *Rep. Sci. Res. Challenger* (Zoology), vol. 13(1).
STOLICZKA, F. 1871. The Pelecypoda, with a review of all known genera of this class, fossil and recent. *Palaeont. Indica* (5), vol. 3.
THIELE, J. 1934. *Handbuch der systematischen Weichtierkunde*, vol. 2(1).

CHELYDRA OSCEOLA STEJNEGER, 1918 (REPTILIA, TESTUDINES): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2282

By Hobart M. Smith and Rozella B. Smith (*Department of Environmental, Population and Organismic Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, U.S.A.*) and David Chiszar (*Department of Psychology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, U.S.A.*)

In 1918 Stejneger described and named a taxon of snapping turtles from peninsular Florida as *Chelydra osceola*. Since then the name has with rare exceptions been accepted in dozens of works as valid at the specific or subspecific level; repeated revisionary studies have demonstrated its validity beyond doubt (Richmond, 1958; Feuer, 1971; Medem, 1977, are the most outstanding examples). The name has been popularised in very widely-used handbooks adopted not only by the general public but as required texts in college and high school courses (Conant, 1958 and 1975, and Blair *et al.*, 1957 and 1968, are the most conspicuous examples). The several guides to the fauna of Florida have also made the name widely known among biologists of the state (e.g., Carr & Goin, 1955; Carr, 1940). Other widely popular books on turtles in particular (e.g. Carr, 1952; Ernst & Barbour, 1972; Pritchard, 1967) use the name.

2. At a different level, within primarily the realm of herpetological specialists, the name has been firmly established by the widely-respected, authoritative checklists of the North American herpetofauna (Stejneger & Barbour, 1923, 1933, 1939, 1943; Schmidt, 1953) and of the turtles of the world (Mertens & Wermuth, 1955; Wermuth & Mertens, 1961, 1977). In addition to these broadly synoptic, highly influential works a dozen or two more specialised accounts of *osceola* have appeared in the literature; a perusal of the last 56 issues of the *Zoological Record* (1924–1979) reveals 12 citations, and certainly more exist.

3. It is thus clearly evident that the name *osceola* has been deeply entrenched in the literature for over 50 years and should therefore not be permitted to be changed for any except the most compelling reasons.

4. A serious threat to this history of nomenclatural stability does exist, however, in the form of two names proposed by Hay in 1916 for Pleistocene fossils from Florida: *Chelydra laticarinata* and *Chelydra sculpta*. Both antedate Stejneger's *Chelydra osceola* (1918) and have been concluded in all probability to be synonymous with it by Richmond (1958), Feuer (1971) and Mlynarski (1976), among others. All these authors have refrained from making the nomenclatural change resulting from that conclusion, however, partly because of reluctance to

disturb the long-established stability of the name *osceola,* and partly because of the uncertainty of definitive allocation inherent in nomenclatural disposition of poorly representative fossils in the context of an extant fauna.

5. Nevertheless the threat to the security of *Chelydra osceola* Stejneger remains despite the admirable constraint exercised by these particular authors. Yet the names for Hay's fossils have seldom been used—very likely not more than a couple of dozen times.

6. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore asked:

(1) to use the plenary powers to rule that the specific name *osceola,* as published in the combination *Chelydra osceola* Stejneger, 1918, is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the following specific names whenever either of them is considered to be a synonym of it: *laticarinata* Hay, 1916 and *sculpta* Hay, 1916, both published in binomina with *Chelydra* Schweigger, 1812;

(2) to place the specific name *osceola* Stejneger, 1918, as published in the binomen *Chelydra osceola* Stejneger, 1918, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over *laticarinata* Hay, 1916 and *sculpta* Hay, 1916, both published in binomina with *Chelydra* Schweigger, 1812, whenever it is considered to be a synonym of either of them.

(3) to place the specific names (a) *laticarinata* Hay, 1916 and (b) *sculpta* Hay, 1916, as published in combination with the generic name *Chelydra* Schweigger, 1812, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with endorsements that neither is to be given priority over *Chelydra osceola* Stejneger, 1918 when it is considered to be a synonym of that name.

REFERENCES

BLAIR, W. F., BLAIR, A., BRODKORB, P., CAGLE, F. R. & MOORE, G. A. 1957. *Vertebrates of the United States.* New York, McGraw-Hill, ix, 819 pp.

——1968. *Vertebrates of the United States.* Second Edition. New York, McGraw-Hill, ix, 616 pp.

CARR, A. F. 1940. A contribution to the herpetology of Florida. *Univ. Florida Publ. biol. Sci. Ser.* vol. 3(1), pp. i–iv and 1–118.

——1952. *Handbook of turtles: the turtles of the United States, Canada and Baja California.* Ithaca, New York, Comstock Publ. Assoc., xviii, 542 pp.

CARR, A. F. & GOIN, C. J. 1955. *Guide to the reptiles, amphibians and freshwater fishes of Florida.* Gainesville, Florida, Univ. Florida Press, ix, 341 pp.

CONANT, R. 1958. *A field guide to reptiles and amphibians of the United States and Canada east of the 100th meridian.* Boston, Houghton Mifflin, xv, 366 pp.

——1975. *A field guide to reptiles and amphibians of eastern and central North America.* Boston, Houghton Mifflin, xviii, 429 pp.

ERNST, C. H. & BARBOUR, R. W. 1972. *Turtles of the United States.* Lexington, Kentucky, Kentucky Univ. Press, x, 347 pp.

FEUER, R. C. 1971. Intergradation of the snapping turtles *Chelydra serpentina* (Linnaeus, 1758) and *Chelydra serpentina osceola* Stejneger, 1918. *Herpetologica,* vol. 27(4), pp. 379–384.

HAY, O. P. 1916. Descriptions of some Floridian fossil vertebrates, belonging mostly to the Pleistocene. *Ann. Rep. Florida State geol. Surv.,* vol. 8, pp. 39–76.

MEDEM, F. 1977. Contribución al conocimiento sobre la taxonomia, distribución geografica y ecología de la tortuga 'bache' (*Chelydra serpentina acutirostris*). *Caldasia,* vol. 12(56), pp. 41–101.

MERTENS, R. & WERMUTH, H. 1955. Die rezenten Schildkröten, Krokodile und Brückenechsen. Eine kritische Liste der heute lebenden Arten und Rassen. *Zool. Jb., Abt. Syst. Ökol. Geogr.,* vol. 83(5), pp. 323–440.

MLYNARSKI, M. 1976. *Handbuch der Palaeoherpetologie. Part 7. Testudines.* Stuttgart, Gustav Fischer, iv, 130 pp.

PRITCHARD, P. C. H. 1967. *Living turtles of the World.* Neptune City, New Jersey, TFH Publs, 288 pp.

RICHMOND, N. D. 1958. The status of the Florida snapping turtle *Chelydra osceola* Stejneger. *Copeia,* vol. 1958(1), pp. 41–43.

SCHMIDT, K. P. 1953. *A checklist of North American amphibians and reptiles.* Chicago, Univ. Chicago Press, viii, 280 pp.

STEJNEGER, L. H. 1918. Description of a new snapping turtle and a new lizard from Florida. *Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington,* vol. 31, pp. 89–92.

STEJNEGER, L. H. & BARBOUR, T. 1923. *A checklist of North American amphibians and reptiles.* Second edition. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, x, 171 pp.

——1933. *A checklist of North American amphibians and reptiles.* Third edition. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, xiv, 185 pp.

——1939. *A checklist of North American amphibians and reptiles.* Fourth edition. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, xvi, 207 pp.

——1943. A checklist of North American amphibians and reptiles. Fifth edition. *Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. Harvard,* vol. 93(1), pp. i–xix and 1–260.

WERMUTH, H. & MERTENS, R. 1961. *Schildkröten, Krokodile, Brückenechsen.* Jena, Fischer, xxvi, 422 pp.

——1977. Liste der rezenten Amphibien und Reptilien. Testudines, Crocodylia, Rhynchocephalia. *Das Tierreich,* vol. 100, pp. i–xxvii and 1–174.

BAINELLA RENNIE, 1930 (ARTHROPODA, TRILOBITA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS BY SUPPRESSION OF *ANCHIOPELLA* REED, 1907. Z.N.(S.)2368

By M. R. Cooper (*National Museum, P.O. Box 240, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe*)

In discussing the Bokkeveld trilobites, Reed (1907) noted that the 'phacopids' could be divided into two species groups. For *Phacops caffer* Salter, *Ph. impressus* Lake, *Ph. ocellus* Lake and *Ph. callitris* Schwarz he suggested the name *Metacryphaeus* whilst noting that '... the remaining Phacopidae from the Bokkeveld Beds seem to fall into another group which in many respects resembles that containing *Dalmanites anchiops,* Green ... I would refer this whole set of species to a special subgroup of *D. anchiops* characterised (1) by fewer (typically 8) segments in the pygidium, only 5 pairs of ribs being present as a rule on the lateral lobes; (2) by the presence of median spines on the axis of thorax and pygidium; (3) by small, instead of stout and long, genal spines ...; (4) by less pronounced coalescence of first and second lateral lobes of glabella. (Nom. prop. *Anchiopella*)' (p. 169).

2. The only species specifically referred to by Reed (1907) as belonging to this 'special subgroup' were *Ph. cristagalli* (Woodward), *Ph. arbuteus* Lake, *Ph. acacia* Schwarz and *Ph. africanus* Salter and, in the first subsequent revision of these species, Reed (1925a, p. 127) stated that '... the name *Anchiopella* was suggested by the author in 1907 for the subgenus of *Dalmanites,* comprising *D. cristagalli, D. acacia* (=*africanus* Salter *sens. restr.*) and *D. arbuteus.*'

3. However, in the same year, whilst discussing certain Silurian species, Reed (1925b, p. 75) noted that '... the Lower Devonian subgenus *Anchiopella* possesses more of their characters, and Hall particularly mentions the usual absence of 'duplication' (=pleural furrows) on the pygidial pleurae of the type species *Dalmanites anchiops,* ...'.

4. In 1927, Reed categorically stated that '... the type which was chosen for this special group [*Anchiopella*] and exemplified by *Dalmanites anchiops* Green, was *Ph. cristagalli* (Woodw.), with *Ph. africanus* Salt., *Ph. arbuteus* Lake and *Ph. acacia* Schwarz as other members of the group' (p. 310).

5. Rennie (1930) discussed the nomenclatural problems surrounding *Anchiopella* and concluded that since the first reference to a type species of *Anchiopella* was that of Reed (1925b, p. 75), who cited *D. anchiops* (Green), '... *Anchiopella* must fall or stand on an interpretation of that species' (p. 333). Consequently, Rennie (1930) transferred all those species assigned by Reed (1925a) to *Dalmanites (Anchiopella)* to his new genus *Bainella,* type species *Bainella bokkeveldensis* Rennie, 1930.

6. Rennie's (1930) treatment has generally been followed and

Bainella has become a widely accepted (Harrington *et al.*, 1959; Baldis, 1967; Eldredge & Braniša, 1980) and distinctive genus of calmoniid trilobite. On the other hand, *Anchiopella* is an obscure genus which has not been used for the *Calymene anchiops* Green group in any of the major studies of this plexus (Delo, 1935 and 1940; Howell, 1951; Stumm, 1954; Lespérance & Bourque, 1971).

7. Lespérance & Bourque (1971) again discussed the nomenclatural problems surrounding *Anchiopella.* They pointed to the fact that this taxon had been created for a 'special subgroup of *D. anchiops'*, which was diagnosed by opposition to the group of *Calymene anchiops* Green and hence could not possibly include the latter species. They concluded that *Anchiopella* was a valid taxon whose type species was *Phacops cristagalli* (Woodward).

8. It is now clear that:

(1) *Anchiopella* Reed, 1907 was created for what was believed to be a special subgroup of *Calymene anchiops* Green, typified by the species *Ph. cristagalli* (Woodward), *Ph. arbuteus* Lake, *Ph. acacia* Schwarz and *Ph. africanus* Salter;

(2) this subgroup was referred (Reed, 1907, p. 169) to as 'the *cristagalli* group' and was diagnosed *by contradistinction* to the group of *Calymene anchiops* Green;

(3) the diagnosis of *Anchiopella* specifically excludes *Calymene anchiops* Green;

(4) *Anchiopella* is a valid taxon whose type species, by the subsequent designation of Reed (1927), is *Encrinurus cristagalli* Woodward, 1873;

(5) the genus *Bainella* Rennie, 1930 is a junior subjective synonym of *Anchiopella* Reed, 1907.

9. The name *Anchiopella* has not been applied to the species group for which it was originally created since 1927 and hence may rightfully be considered a forgotten name. If stability in the nomenclature is to be maintained, the genus *Anchiopella* Reed, 1907 should be suppressed in favour of *Bainella* Rennie, 1930.

10. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Anchiopella* Reed, 1907, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Bainella* Rennie, 1930 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Bainella bokkeveldensis* Rennie, 1930, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *bokkeveldensis* Rennie, 1930, as published in the binomen *Bainella bokkeveldensis* (specific name of type species of *Bainella* Rennie, 1930) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Anchiopella* Reed, 1907, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BALDIS, B. 1967. Some Devonian trilobites of the Argentine Precordillera, pp. 789–796 in OSWALD, D. H. (Ed.), *International Symposium on the Devonian System* (Calgary, Alberta Society for Petroleum Geologists).

DELO, D. M. 1935. A revision of the phacopid trilobites. *J. Paleont.*, vol. 9, pp. 402–420.

——1940. Phacopid trilobites of North America. *Spec. Pap. geol. Soc. Am.*, vol. 29, pp. 1–135.

ELDREDGE, N. & BRANIŠA, L. 1980. Calmoniid trilobites of the Lower Devonian *Scaphiocoelia* Zone of Bolivia, with remarks on related species. *Bull. Am. Mus. nat. Hist.*, vol. 165, pp. 181–290.

HARRINGTON, H. J. *et al.* 1959. *Treatise on invertebrate paleontology.* Part 0, Arthropoda 1 (Boulder, Geol. Soc. of America and Univ. Kansas Press).

HOWELL, B. F. 1951. The Vogdes Collection of trilobites. *Trans. San Diego Soc. nat. Hist.*, vol. 11, pp. 257–328,

LESPÉRANCE, P. J. & BOURQUE, P.-A. 1971. The Synphoriinae: an evolutionary pattern of Lower and Middle Devonian trilobites. *J. Paleont.*, vol. 45, pp. 182–208.

REED, F. R. C. 1907. The fauna of the Bokkeveld Beds. *Geol. Mag.*, n.s., vol. 4, pp. 165–171, 222–232.

——1925a. Revision of the fauna of the Bokkeveld Beds. *Ann. S. Afr. Mus.*, vol. 22, pp. 27–225.

——1925b. Some new Silurian trilobites. *Geol. Mag.*, vol. 62, pp. 67–76.

——1927. Recent work on the Phacopidae. *Geol. Mag.*, vol. 64, pp. 308–322, 337–353.

RENNIE, J. V. L. 1930. Some Phacopidae from the Bokkeveld Series. *Trans. R. Soc. s. Afr.*, vol. 18, pp. 327–360.

STUMM, E. C. 1954. Lower Middle Devonian phacopid trilobites from Michigan, southwestern Ontario and the Ohio valley. *Contrib. Mus. Paleont. Univ. Michigan*, vol. 11, pp. 201–221.

WOODWARD, H. 1873. On a new trilobite from the Cape of Good Hope. *Q. Jl geol. Soc. Lond.* vol. 29, pp. 31–33.

CRINODES HERRICH-SCHÄFFER, 1855 AND *PERO* HERRICH-SCHÄFFER, 1855 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION. N.Z.(S.)2436

By D. S. Fletcher & I. W. B. Nye (*British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*)

In the interest of maintaining existing usage, the Commission is asked to rule, by the use of its plenary powers, that *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 and *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855, are to be treated as the names of independent genera and not as objective replacement names for previously named genera.

(1) *Tarsolepis* Butler, 1872 and *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855

2. *Crino* Hübner, [1821] 1806, *Samml. exot. Schmett.*, vol. 2, pl. [197], was established as a monotypic genus for *Crino sommeri* Hübner, [1821] 1806, *ibidem*, vol. 2, pl. [197], a species of NOTODONTIDAE from Asia. *Crino* Hübner, [1821], is a junior homonym of *Crino* Lamarck, [1798], *in* Virey, *J. Phys. Chim. Hist. nat.*, vol. 4 [47], p. 429—Vermes. *Crino sommeri*, the type species of *Crino* Hübner, [1821], is, however, a senior subjective synonym of *Tarsolepis remicauda* Butler, 1872, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (4), vol. 10, p. 125, pl. 8, the type species, by original designation, of *Tarsolepis* Butler, 1872, *ibidem*, vol. 10, p. 125. *Tarsolepis* is therefore available for use as a subjective replacement name for *Crino* Hübner, and has been used as the valid name for that Old World genus since the two names were synonymised by Kirby, 1892, *Synonymic Catalogue Lepidoptera Heterocera*, vol. 1, p. 616.

3. *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855, *Syst. Bearbeitung Schmett. Europa*, vol. 6, p. 91, was established in the form '*Crinodes* m. (*Crino* HV [Hübner's *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmett.*] schon vergeben)' for three species, of which *Phalaena bellatrix* Stoll, 1780, *in* Cramer, *Uitlandsche Kapellen* (*Papillons exot.*), vol. 4, p. 32, pl. 305, fig. F, was designated as type species by Kirby, 1892, *Synonymic Catalogue Lepidoptera Heterocera*, vol. 1, p. 616. This is a New World species of NOTODONTIDAE from Surinam, and since 1892 *Crinodes* has had universal usage in the relevant New World literature in this sense. With one exception (Strand, 1910, p. 199) all authors have hitherto used *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer to denote a New World genus distinct from *Tarsolepis* Butler (= *Crino* Hübner), an Old World genus.

4. These interpretations have had general usage in the literature of NOTODONTIDAE during the last ninety years, including the following widely used works:

Old World usage of *Tarsolepis*: Kirby, 1892, p. 616; Hampson, 1896, p. 126; Semper, 1896, p. 409; Grünberg, 1912, p. 284; Marumo,

1920, p. 286; Gaede, 1930, p. 607; 1933, p. 173; 1934, p. 4; Roepke, 1944, p. 80; Inoue, 1956, p. 405; 1958, p. 53; Kiriakoff, 1967, p. 14; 1968, p. 18; Watson, Fletcher & Nye, 1980, p. 189; Inoue, 1982, vol. 1, p. 604, vol. 2, p. 322.

New World usage of *Crinodes*: Kirby, 1892, p. 616; Schaus, 1901, p. 276; Holland, 1903, p. 301; Dyar, [1903], p. 258; Packard, 1905, p. 90; Barnes & McDunnough, 1917, p. 96; Draudt, 1932, p. 924; Gaede, 1934, p. 218; McDunnough, 1938, p. 134; Forbes, 1939, p. 263; Watson, Fletcher & Nye, 1980, p. 46.

5. It has, however, been brought to our attention recently that there is a possible alternative interpretation, namely that *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer was established as an objective replacement name for *Crino* Hübner. Further, we understand that it is intended to adopt this interpretation in a forthcoming check list of North American Lepidoptera. Such an interpretation would result in *Tarsolepis,* which has been in general use in the Old World for the past 90 years, being replaced by *Crinodes,* which has had universal use in the New World for over 100 years for a different genus. New World species currently included in *Crinodes* would then be placed in *Astylis* Boisduval, 1872, a name that has been in the synonymy of *Crinodes* for over ninety years.

(2) *Gonodontis* Hübner, [1823], and *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855

6. *Gonodontis* Hübner, [1823] 1816, *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmett.*, p. 287, was established for three species of which *Phalaena clelia* Cramer, 1780, *Uitlandsche Kapellen* (*Papillons exot.*), vol. 3, pp. 172, 174, pl. 288, figs B, C was designated as type species by Warren, 1893, *Proc. zool. Soc. London,* for 1893, p. 398. This is a species of GEOMETRIDAE from India.

7. *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855, *Syst. Bearbeitung Schmett. Europa,* vol. 6, pp. 108, 121, was established in the form '*Pero* m. der Name *Gonodontis* ist längst vergeben' for two species, of which *Gonodontis rectisectaria* Herrich-Schäffer, [1855] 1850–1858, *Samml. neuer oder wenig bekannter aussereur. Schmett.*, vol. 1 (1), wrapper, pl. 58, fig. 325, was designated as type species by Poole, 1970, *A revision of the American moth genus Pergama* (*Lepidoptera: Geometridae*), p. 3. This is a species of GEOMETRIDAE from Brazil.

8. *Gonodontis* is not a junior homonym and is currently in general use as the valid name for a small Old World genus. *Pero* has been in general use in the New World for over 100 years for a different genus, represented only in the New World and now containing about 300 species.

9. These interpretations have had general use in the literature of the GEOMETRIDAE, including the following widely used works published during the last 100 years:

Old World usage of *Gonodontis*: Warren, 1893, p. 398; Swinhoe,

1900, p. 248; Holloway, 1976, p. 75; 1979, p. 333; Fletcher, 1979, p. 92.

New World usage of *Pero*: Herrich-Schäffer, 1870, p. 184; Möschler, 1882, p. 400; Grossbeck, 1910, p. 359; Barnes & McDunnough, 1917, p. 123; Cassino & Swett, 1922, p. 137; Kaye & Lamont, 1927, p. 98; McDunnough, 1938, p. 170; Schaus, 1940, p. 317; Forbes, 1948, p. 82; McDunnough, 1949, p. 1; Rindge, 1955, p. 1; McGuffin, 1963, p. 1159; Fletcher, 1979, p. 159.

10. If *Crinodes* in the NOTODONTIDAE is to be treated as an objective replacement name, then *Pero* in the GEOMETRIDAE must be treated similarly. *Pero,* currently in general use as the valid name for a large genus of some 300 species in the New World, would then become a junior objective synonym of the Old World generic name *Gonodontis* and the species currently included in *Pero* would be placed in *Pergama* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855, a genus-group name synonymised with *Pero* by Prout, 1910, pp. 311, 312. We understand, however, that in contrast with the treatment of *Crinodes* it is intended to retain the general current usage of *Pero* in the forthcoming check list of North American Lepidoptera. We can see no justification for this difference of treatment and wish to ensure that stability is maintained in the Old World and the New World in both cases.

11. In order to conserve the long-accepted names *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855, and *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855, in their accustomed meanings, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genera *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 and *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 and to designate the following species as their type species:
   (a) for *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855, *Phalaena bellatrix* Stoll, 1780;
   (b) for *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855, *Gonodontis rectisectaria* Herrich-Schäffer, [1855];

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above, *Phalaena bellatrix* Stoll, 1780;
   (b) *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Gonodontis rectisectaria* Herrich-Schäffer, [1855];

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
   (a) *bellatrix* Stoll, 1780, as published in the binomen *Phalaena bellatrix* (specific name of type species of *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855);
   (b) *rectisectaria* Herrich-Schäffer, [1855], as published in the

binomen *Gonodontis rectisectaria* (specific name of type species of *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855).

REFERENCES

BARNES, W. & McDUNNOUGH, J. H. 1917. *Check List of the Lepidoptera of boreal America,* viii+392 pp. Illinois.

CASSINO, S. E. & SWETT, L. W. 1922. Some new Species of the Genus *Pero. Lepidopterist,* vol. 3, pp. 137–144.

DRAUDT, M. & SEITZ, A. 1913–1940. *In* Seitz, *Gross-Schmett. Erde,* vol. 6 (American Fauna), viii+1452 pp., 185 col. pls. Stuttgart. (Notodontidae, 1931–1934, pp. 901–1070).

DYAR, H. G. [1903] 1902. A List of North American Lepidoptera. *Bull. U.S. natn. Mus.*, vol. 52, xix+723 pp.

FLETCHER, D. S. 1979. *In* Nye, *Generic Names of Moths of the World,* vol. 3, xx+243 pp., 2 pls. London.

FORBES, W. T. M. 1939. The Lepidoptera of Barro Colorado Island, Panama. *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harv.*, vol. 85(4), pp. i–vii, 97–322, 8 pls.

——1948. Lepidoptera of New York and neighboring States, part II. *Mem. Cornell Univ. agric. Exp. Stn.* Memoir 274, 263 pp., 255 figs.

GAEDE, M. & SEITZ, A. 1907–1930. *In* Seitz, *Gross-Schmett. Erde,* vol. 10 (Indo-Australian Fauna), iv+909 pp., 104 col. pls. Stuttgart. (Notodontidae, 1930, pp. 605–655).

——1930–1934. *In* Seitz, *Gross-Schmett. Erde,* vol. 2 (Supplement) (Palaearctic Fauna), vii+315 pp., 16 col. pls. Stuttgart. (Notodontidae, 1933, pp. 173–186).

GAEDE, M. 1934. *In* Strand, *Lepidopterorum Catalogus,* part 59 (Notodontidae), 351 pp. Berlin.

GEYER, C. See Hübner, J.

GROSSBECK, J. A. 1910. Studies of the North American Geometrid Moths of the Genus *Pero. Proc. U.S. natn. Mus.*, vol. 38, pp. 359–377, 4 pls.

GRÜNBERG, K. & SEITZ, A. 1906–1913. *In* Seitz, *Gross-Schmett. Erde,* vol. 2 (Palaearctic Fauna), vii+479 pp., 56 col. pls. Stuttgart. (Notodontidae, 1912, pp. 281–319.)

HAMPSON, G. [1893] 1892. *Fauna Br. India* (Moths), vol. 1, xxiv+527 pp., 333 text-figs. London, Calcutta, Bombay, Berlin. (Notodontidae, pp. 124–177, text-figs 72–109.)

HERRICH-SCHÄFFER, G. A. W. 1850–[1858]. *Samml. neuer oder wenig bekannter aussereur. Schmett.*, vol. 1, 84 pp., Series I (Heterocera), 96 col. pls. Regensburg. (For dates of publication, see Fletcher, 1979, p. xiii.)

——1851–1856. *Syst. Bearbeitung Schmett. Eur.*, vol. 6 (Nachtrag zum ersten Band), 178 pp. Regensburg.

——1870. Die Schmetterlinge der Insel Cuba. Geometrina (part). *KorrespBl. zool.-min. Ver. Regensburg,* vol. 24, pp. 180–190.

HOLLAND, W. J. 1903. *The Moth Book,* xxiv+479 pp., 263 text-figs, 48 col. pls. New York.

HOLLOWAY, J. 1976. *Moths of Borneo with special reference to Mount Kinabalu,* x+264 pp., 727+383 figs. Kuala Lumpur.

——1979. *A Survey of the Lepidoptera, Biogeography and Ecology of New Caledonia,* xii+588 pp., 153 text-figs, 87 pls. The Hague.

HÜBNER, J. 1816–[1826]. *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmett.*, 431 pp.+ Anzeiger, 72 pp. Augsburg.
——1823. *Zuträge Samml. exot. Schmett.*, vol. 2, [1]+[40] pp., pls [36]–[69]. Augsburg.
——1832. (Geyer, *in* Hübner), *Ibidem*, vol. 4, [1]–48 pp., pls [104]–[137].
——1837. (Geyer, *in* Hübner). *Ibidem*, vol. 5, [1]–52 pp., pls [138]–[172].
INOUE, H. 1956. *Check List Lepidoptera Japan*, part 4, pp. 365–429. Tokyo.
INOUE, H. *et al.* 1958. *Icones Heterocerorum Japonicorum*, vol. 22, vi+303 pp., text-figs, col. pls 65–136. Osaka.
——1982. *Moths of Japan*, vol. 1, 966 pp.; vol. 2, 552 pp., 392 pls. Tokyo.
KAYE, W. J. & LAMONT, N. 1927. A Catalogue of the Trinidad Lepidoptera Heterocera (Moths). *Mem. Dep. Agric. Trin.*, vol. 3, viii+144 pp., 2 pls.
KIRBY, W. F. 1892. *Synonymic Cat. Lepidoptera Heterocera*, vol. 1, 951 pp. London, Berlin.
KIRIAKOFF, S. G. 1967. *In* Wytsman, *Genera Insectorum*, vol. 217 (B), 238 pp., 136 text-figs., 8 pls. Anvers.
——1968. *In* Wytsman, *ibidem*, vol. 217 (C), 269 pp., 195 text-figs, 11 pls. Anvers.
MARUMO, N. 1920. A Revision of the Notodontidae of Japan, Corea and Formosa. *J. Coll. Agric. imp. Univ. Tokyo*, vol. 6, pp. 273–359, 18 pls.
McDUNNOUGH, J. 1938. Check List of the Lepidoptera of Canada and the United States of America. *Mem. sth. Calif. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 1, 272 pp.
——1949. Critical Notes on certain *Pero* Species (Lepidoptera: Geometridae). *Am. Mus. Novit.*, number 1393, 11 pp.
McGUFFIN, W. C. 1963. The immature Stages of the Canadian Species of *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer (Lepidoptera: Geometridae). *Can. Ent.*, vol. 95, pp. 1159–1167, 12 figs.
MÖSCHLER, H. B. 1882. Beiträge zur Schmetterlings-Fauna von Surinam IV. *Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien*, vol. 31 (Abh.), pp. 393–442, 2 pls.
PACKARD, A. S. 1905. Monograph of the Bombycine Moths of North America (2). *Mem. natn. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 9, 149 pp., 61 pls.
POOLE, R. W. 1970. *A Revision of the American Moth Genus Pergama (Lepidoptera: Geometridae)*, iv+729 pp., 1116 figs. University Microfilms International. Michigan, U.S.A. & London, England.
PROUT, L. B. 1910. On the Geometridae of the Argentine Republic. *Trans. ent. Soc. Lond*, vol. 1910, pp. 204–345, 1 pl.
RINDGE, F. 1955. A Revision of some Species of *Pero* from the western United States (Lepidoptera, Geometridae). *Am. Mus. Novit.*, number 1750, 33 pp., 20 figs.
ROEPKE, W. 1944. On the Genera *Dudusa* Walk. and *Tarsolepis* Butl. in the Dutch East Indies. (Lepidopt. Het., fam. Notodontidae.) *Tijdschr. Ent.*, vol. 86, pp. 77–83.
SCHAUS, W. 1901. A Revision of the American Notodontidae. *Trans. ent. Soc. Lond.*, vol. 1901, pp. 257–343, 2 pls.
——1940. Insects of Porto Rico and the Virgin Islands. *Scient. Surv. P. Rico*, vol. 12(3), pp. 291–417.
SEMPER, G. 1896–1902. Die Schmetterlinge der Philippinischen Inseln. *Reisen im Archipel der Philippinen von Dr G. Semper*, (2) vol. 6 (Abt. 2), pp. 381–728, 36 pls. Wiesbaden. (Notodontidae pp. 409–416.)
STRAND, E. 1910. Schmetterlinge aus Zentral- und West-Sumatra. *Dt. ent. Z. Iris*, vol. 24, pp. 190–208.

SWINHOE, C. 1900. *Catalogue east. and Aust. Lepidoptera Heterocera Colln Oxf. Univ. Mus.*, vol. 2, 630 pp., 8 pls. Oxford.

WARREN, W. 1893. On new Genera and Species of Moths of the Family Geometridae from India in the Collection of H. J. Elwes. *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.*, vol. 1893, pp. 341–434, pls 30–32.

WATSON, A., FLETCHER, D. S. & NYE, I. W. B. 1980. *In* Nye, *Generic Names of Moths of the World*, vol. 2, xiv+228 pp., 1 pl. London.

POSTSCRIPT

Since this case was submitted to the Commission the check list of North American Lepidoptera containing the changes referred to in paragraphs 5 and 10 above has been published under the title: HODGES, R. W. *et al.* 1983. *Check List of the Lepidoptera of America north of Mexico*, xxiv+284 pp., London.

I.W.B.N.

NASSARIIDAE IREDALE, 1916 (GASTROPODA): REVISED PROPOSALS FOR CONSERVATION. Z.N.(S.)1987

By David Heppell (*Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh*)

An application for the conservation of the family name NASSARIIDAE (type genus *Nassarius* Duméril, 1806) was presented to the Commission by Mr W. O. Cernohorsky (*Auckland Institute and Museum, New Zealand*) in 1972 (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 29, pp. 62–63). He provided additional details in 1974 (vol. 31, pp. 212–214). His case required the grant to NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916 of nomenclatural precedence over four older family-group names. The resolution of the problem depends on the status, and hence the type species, of *Nassarius*. Mr Cernohorsky treated it as a new name for a nominal genus of its own with type species *Buccinum arcularia* Linnaeus, 1758, by subsequent monotypy by Froriep, 1806, p. 167. Iredale, on the other hand, treated it as a new name for *Nassa* Lamarck, 1799, non [Röding], 1798. In that case the type species of *Nassarius* would be *Buccinum mutabile* Linnaeus, 1758. This view was strongly upheld by Dr Myra Keen (*Stanford University, California*). The basic facts are as follows.

2. Duméril, 1806, *Zoologie analytique*, p. xxiii, said: 'La classe des mollusques offrira des ordres tout-à-fait nouveaux; mais ils ont été faits ou indiqués, déjà par M. Cuvier lui-même, qui a le premier séparé ces êtres de la classe nombreuse des vers de Linné. Tous les savans ont adopté maintenant cette classification; et comme notre objet étoit de faire connoître les animaux et non les coquilles qui les revêtent, nous n'avons profité que dans très-peu de circonstances des travaux de MM. Poli et Lamarck, cette partie de la science laissant encore beaucoup à désirer aux naturalistes.' He then proposes 38 new names for molluscan genera. Each name is accompanied by a description, but no species are referred to any of the genera; and each name differs from a pre-existing available name only in being given the termination *'-arius'*. Malacologists have not been unanimous in their treatment of these names, as already indicated. For that reason, any attempt to deal with them all by a single ruling would cause confusion. Some of them might well be disposed of by being treated as unjustified emendations of the earlier names they resemble. Others would then have to be dealt with as nomenclaturally valid names under the Law of Priority and accepted or suppressed as the requirements of stability would indicate in each case. *Nassarius* is in this latter group.

3. Iredale, 1916, *Proc. malacol. Soc. London*, vol. 12, p. 82, treated *Nassarius* as a new replacement name for *Nassa* Lamarck, 1799, non [Röding], 1798, but there is no evidence that Duméril knew of the work now attributed to Röding (the *Museum Boltenianum*), and the only authors he expressly cites are Cuvier, Poli and Lamarck. It is more likely that he was proposing a new name for the genus of animals that inhabit the genus of shells called *Nassa* by Lamarck. In that case, the

type species of the genus is determined by the action of the first author subsequently to refer one or more species to the genus. The author in question is Froriep, who later in 1806 published a German translation of Duméril's work and referred one species to each of the genera. The species he referred to *Nassarius* was *Buccinum arcularia* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.*, ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 737, and this is then the type species of the genus, by subsequent monotypy. This is the situation preferred by Mr Cernohorsky.

4. Both *Nassa* [Röding] and *Nassa* Lamarck are derived from the French vernacular 'les nassiers'—a name given to various small carnivorous gastropods that were attracted to 'nasses', i.e. lobster pots and similar basket-like fish traps. Since Duméril would no doubt have considered the animals of these to be congeneric (although inhabiting a variety of shell genera) his concept of *Nassarius* no doubt included both *Nassa* [Röding] and *Nassa* Lamarck.

5. Dr Keen's concern in this case seems to arise from a fear that, if *Nassarius* is treated as Mr Cernohorsky would wish, then all Duméril's generic names would have to be treated in the same way. Some of them would then become senior synonyms (objective or subjective) of later generic names in uninterrupted general use since their establishment. This would cause needless confusion and a quantity of extra work for the Commission, both of which would be avoided if such names could be disposed of as unjustified emendations. It is for this reason that I have suggested that each Duméril name should be considered on its merits and that the *Nassarius* case be dealt with in isolation, without prejudice to any other Duméril name. The other names can then be dealt with separately, singly or in groups, as their merits indicate. There is no doubt that Mr Cernohorsky's application represents majority usage of *Nassarius*, at least outside the U.S.A.

6. If Mr Cernohorsky's application is accepted, *Arcularia* Link, 1807, *Beschr. nat. Samml. Univ. Rostock* (3), p. 126, becomes a junior subjective synonym of *Nassarius*. Its type species is *Arcularia coronata* Link, 1807, *ibid.*, p. 126, by subsequent designation by Mörch, 1863, *Proc. zool. Soc. London* for 1862, p. 227. Link's species is based on references to Martini & Chemnitz, 1773, *Neues syst. Conch. Cabinet*, vol. 2, figs. 409–412, and to Gmelin, 1791, p. 3480. Here is found Gmelin's account of *Buccinum arcularia* Linnaeus, 1758, with a primary reference to *Mus. Lud. Ulr.*, p. 608, no. 260* and 17 other references, one of which is to the same figures in Martini & Chemnitz cited by Link. ARCULARIIDAE Hedley, 1915 or 1916, likewise becomes a synonym of NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916. As its date of publication is uncertain (see Cernohorsky, 1974, p. 213) the Commission should rule that it is to be deemed a junior objective synonym of NASSARIIDAE. *Sphaeronassa* Locard, 1886, *Prodr. Malacol. France*, Cat. gén. Moll. France, Moll. mar., pp. 132, 548, type species, by original designation (p. 548), *Buccinum mutabile* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.*, ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 738,

is then available for the group now ranked by some authors as *Nassarius* s.s.

7. Apart from ARCULARIIDAE, the family-group names senior, to NASSARIIDAE mentioned by Mr Cernohorsky are CYCLONASSINAE Gill, 1871, CYLLENINAE Bellardi, 1882, DORSANINAE Cossmann, 1901, and ALECTRIONIDAE Dall, 1908. To deal with these names in relation to NASSARIIDAE by the relative precedence procedure would be extremely cumbersome and the result might be taxonomically fragile. An alternative solution can be found which gives the pragmatic result desired.

8. The first family-group name based on *Nassa* is NASSINAE Swainson, 1835, *Elements modern Conchology,* pp. 18, 20. It contains a genus *Nassa* described as 'Wrinkled, the inner lip thickened and spreading out'. This is clearly *Nassa* Lamarck, non [Röding]. By 1840, *Treatise Malacology,* pp. 63, 69, 299, the family-group taxon had come to include a genus *Nassa,* clearly Lamarck's nassariid genus, and containing *Buccinum arcularia* Linnaeus. This is the species that Mr Cernohorsky takes to be the type species of *Nassarius,* itself the type genus of NASSARIIDAE. The pragmatic solution to the problem of conserving that name would, therefore, be for the Commission to use its plenary powers to give NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916, the priority of NASSINAE Swainson, 1835, and to rule that it is to be cited as 'NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916 (1835)'.

9. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the family-group name NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916, is to be given the same priority as the family-group name NASSINAE Swainson, 1835, and that it is to be cited as 'NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916 (1835)';

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Nassarius* Duméril, 1806 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent monotypy (Froriep, 1806), *Buccinum arcularia* Linnaeus, 1758;

(b) *Sphaeronassa* Locard, 1886 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Buccinum mutabile* Linnaeus, 1758;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *arcularia* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Buccinum arcularia* (specific name of type species of *Nassarius* Duméril, 1806);

(b) *mutabile* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Buccinum mutabile* (specific name of type species of *Sphaeronassa* Locard, 1886);

(4) to place the family-group name NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916 (type genus *Nassarius* Duméril, 1806) on the Official List of

Family-Group Names in Zoology with an endorsement that it is to be cited as 'NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916 (1835)'.

[In view of the differing views that have been taken of the problem here presented, the Commission reminds zoologists that Article 78e applies and that no conclusions or inferences are to be drawn from the present case concerning any other generic name published by Duméril, 1806, *Zoologie analytique.*

R.V.M.]

TRICELIA VARIOPEDATA RENIER [1807] (POLYCHAETA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF THE SPECIFIC NAME. Z.N.(S.)1093

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

In Opinion 427 (1956, *Ops. Decls Int. Comm, zool. Nom.* vol. 14 (11), pp. 281–310) the Commission rejected the following work as not validly published: Renier, S. A. [1807], *Tavole per servire alle classificazione e connoscenza degli animali.* Most of the generic names in that work were placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology, but a number were reserved for further consideration, including *Tricelia.* The late Dr Lemche in a letter to the Commission's office dated 27 May 1955, said of this name: '*Tricelia* is a synonym of the generic name *Chaetopterus* Cuvier, which is in common use. There is no reason to revive Renier's generic name, but the specific name *variopedata* Renier is a very well known name of an extremely strange polychaete known to most students of zoology because of its peculiar outline and strong powers of luminescence. I think it is essential to keep the specific name.'

2. *Tricelia* and *T. variopedata* appeared in tavola vi of Renier's work. The status of *Chaetopterus* is fortunately not in doubt. The genus was described by Cuvier, 1830, *Règne animal* (2nd ed.), vol. 3, p. 208. The generic description applies also to the only included species (hence the type species by monotypy), *C. pergamentaceus* Cuvier, ibid.

3. Polychaete specialists are asked to comment on the following proposals: that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should

(a) use its plenary powers to rule that the specific name *variopedata* Renier, [1807], as appearing in the binomen *Tricelia variopedata,* is an available name;

(b) place the generic name *Chaetopterus* Cuvier, 1830 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Chaetopterus pergamentaceus* Cuvier, 1830, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(c) place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology

(i) *variopedata* Renier, [1807], as appearing in the binomen *Tricelia variopedata,* and as ruled under the plenary powers in (a) above to be an available name;

(ii) *pergamentaceus* Cuvier, 1830, as published in the binomen *Chaetopterus pergamentaceus* (specific name of type species of *Chaetopterus* Cuvier, 1830);

(d) place the generic name *Tricelia* Renier, [1807], a name appearing in a work ruled in Opinion 427 to be not validly published, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

PREAMBLE to resurrected Cases Z.N.(S.)1686, 1687
(see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 22 (2), pp. 102, 103)

These two cases are the last remaining from several originally submitted by Francis Hemming in 1964 under the old '*nomen oblitum* rule' (Art. 23b), and shelved when that rule was placed in abeyance. Hemming had discovered those *nomina oblita* during his exhaustive research of the ancient generic names for his 1967 classic 'Generic Names of the Butterflies and their Type-Species' (*Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist.* (Ent.) Suppl. vol. 9), published three years after his death. The cases have been in suspense now for nearly 20 years; none of the older names have been adopted, and early settlement is requested in order to end present uncertainty and threats to stability.

C. F. COWAN

EUPHAEDRA HÜBNER, [1819] (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)1686

(see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 22 (2), p. 102)

By Charles F. Cowan (*4 Thornfield Terrace, Grange-over-Sands, Cumbria LA11 7DR, England*)

Euphaedra Hübner, [1819], type species by designation by Scudder, 1875, *Papilio cyparissa* Cramer, [1775], is the universally known name of an unusually large and colourful genus of Nymphalid butterflies in Africa. Unfortunately, when Hübner's *Tentamen* [1806] was suppressed by Opinion 97, one of the names he had used in it became technically available in a slightly different sense, as a senior subjective synonym of *Euphaedra*. That name is *Najas* Hübner, [1807], whose type species by monotypy, *Najas themis* Hübner, [1807], is currently considered to be congeneric with *E. cyparissa* (Cramer). The name *Najas* in this sense was quickly abandoned by Hübner and has never been adopted, while *Euphaedra* has remained in universal use for well over 100 years, ten recent examples being: Peters, 1952, pp. 63–66; van Someren & Jackson (1960), pp. 127–137, pls. 2–5; Gifford, 1965, p. 106; Pinhey, 1965, pp. 92–93; Hemming, 1967, pp. 179, 304; Cooper, 1973, p. 71; Lewis, 1973, pls. 100, 101; Laithwaite *et al.*, 1975, p. 204, pl. 237 g; Pinhey & Loe, 1977, pp. 25, 26, 34, 36–37; Carcasson, 1981, pp. 45, 46, 165–167.

2. *Euphaedra* of present authors is ripe for 'splitting', but it so happens that the two type species involved here are very closely related (Nos. 2472, 2474 among over 80 species listed in the subgenus *Euphaedra* alone) and it is considered that to save *Najas* for any who 'think it a genus distinct from *Euphaedra*' would delay rather than assist stability.

3. The International Commission is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Najas* Hübner, [1807], for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy and, having done so;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Euphaedra* Hübner, [1819] (gender feminine), type-species by designation by Scudder, 1875, *Papilio cyparissa* Cramer, [1775],

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *cyparissa* Cramer, [1775], as published in the binomen *Papilio cyparissa* (type-species of *Euphaedra* Hübner, [1819]),

(4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Najas* Hübner, [1807], as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

Euphaedra Hübner, [1819], *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmettlinge*, p. 39 Type Designation; Scudder, 1875. *Proc. Amer. Acad, Arts Sci.* vol. 10, p. 172

Papilio cyparissa Cramer, [1775], *Uitlandsche Kapellen etc.* vol. 1 (4), p. 63, pl. 39 figs. D, E.

Najas, and *N. themis* Hübner, [1807]. *Sammlung exotischer Schmettlinge* vol. 1, pl. [60].

RECENT REFERENCES

CARCASSON, R. H. 1981. *Collins' Handguide to the Butterflies of Africa.* xix, 1–100 (col. figs throughout), 101–188 pp. 8°. London.

COOPER, R. 1973. *Butterflies of Rhodesia*, [6], 138 pp., 32 pls. 8°. (Longmans, Rhodesia), Salisbury.

GIFFORD, D. 1965. *List of the Butterflies of Malawi*, [7], i–vi, 1–148 pp., 9 pls. 8°. (Hist. Sci. Soc. Malawi), Blantyre.

HEMMING, F. 1967. The generic Names of the Butterflies and their Type-species. *Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist.* (Entomol.) Suppl. vol. 9. 509 pp.

LEWIS, H. L. 1973. *Butterflies of the World.* xvi pp., 208 pls., pp. [2], 209–312. 4°. (Harrap) London.

LAITHWAITE, E., WATSON, A. & WHALLEY, P. E. S. 1975. *Dictionary of Butterflies and Moths in Colour.* xlviii pp., 144 pls., pp. 145–296. 4°. (Michael Joseph) London.

PETERS, W. 1952. *Provisional Checklist of the Butterflies of the Ethiopian Region.* [7], 9–201 pp. 8°. (Classey) Feltham.

PINHEY, E. C. G. 1965. *Butterflies of Southern Africa.* xi, 240 pp., 42 pls. 8°. (Longmans, Rhodesia) Salisbury.

——— & LOE, I. D. 1977. *Guide to the Butterflies of Central and Southern Africa.* 106 pp., illustr. Oblong 8°. (Causton & Sons) London.

VAN SOMEREN, V. G. L. & JACKSON, T. H. E. 1960. Some comments on Protective Resemblance amongst African Lepidoptera. *J. Lepid. Soc.* vol. 13 (1959) (3), pp. 121–150 (incl. 10 pls.).

OUROCNEMIS BAKER, 1887 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)1687

(see *Bull. zool. Nom.* 22 (2), p. 103)

by Charles F. Cowan (*4 Thornfield Terrace, Grange-over-Sands, Cumbria LA11 7DR, England*)

Aetheius Hübner, [1819], was a generic name introduced for three species which Hübner placed among the Hesperiid ('Skipper') butterflies but which actually are all Riodinids ('Metalmarks'). By 1875 when Scudder designated the type species, the true affiliation of two was known, so he designated the third 'for it alone belongs to the group in which Hübner placed this genus'; *Papilio archytas* Stoll, [1787]. Thereafter, the name *Aetheius* disappeared from the literature, being rightly ignored by Hesperiid workers and never discovered by Riodinid specialists.

2. In 1887 Baker introduced the generic name *Ourocnemis* for the Riodinid species *Anteros axiochus* Hewitson, [1867], which is now considered subjectively to be conspecific with *P. archytas* Stoll. To resurrect the defunct name *Aetheius* now, sinking *Ourocnemis* which has been in continual use for nearly a century, would stretch the Law of Priority to extreme length at the expense of stability and universality. Recent usages of *Ourocnemis* are;
Lichy, 1936, p. 204, fig., & 1938, pl., fig. 4; Hall, 1940, p. 35; Forster, 1948, p. 111, no. 189; Hemming, 1967, p. 328; Ortiz, 1967, p. 14 (as "Aurocnemis"); Zikán & Zikán, 1968, p. 55; Tello, 1968, p. 220; Lamas, 1969, p. 318; Lewis, 1973, pl. 77, fig. 14 (as *"Ourochnemis archytes"*); Biezanko *et al*, 1979, p. 16.

3. The International Commission is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of the

Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy the generic name *Aetheius* Hübner, [1819] and, having done so;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Ourocnemis* Baker, 1887 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Anteros axiochus* Hewitson, [1867],

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *archytas* Stoll, [1787] as published in the binomen *Papilio archytas* (the senior subjective synonym of *Anteros axiochus* Hewitson, the type species of *Ourocnemis* Baker, 1887),

(4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Aetheius* Hübner, [1819], as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

Aetheius Hübner, [1819]. *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmettlinge* (7), p. 109 Type Designation; Scudder, 1875. *Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci.* vol. 10, p. 104

Papilio archytas Stoll, [1787]. *Aanhangsel van ... Uitlandsche Kapellen ... Cramer* (1), p. 25, pl. 5, fig. 5

Anteros axiochus Hewitson, [1867]. *Illustrations of new Species of exotic Butterflies* vol. 4 (63), p. [77], pl. ANTEROS I, figs 1, 2

Ourocnemis Baker, 1887. *Trans. entomol. Soc. Lond.* 1887, pp. 175–176, pl. 9.

RECENT REFERENCES

BIEZANKO, C. M., MIELKE, O. H. H. & WEDERHOFF, A. 1979. Contribuicao ao estudo faunístico dos Riodinidae do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil (Lepidoptera). *Acta biológica paranaense* vol. 7 (1/4), pp. 7–22.

FORSTER, W. 1948. Liste der von Pater Cornelius Vogl in Maracay und Caracas gesammelten Schmetterlinge. *Bol. Entomol. Venezolana* vol. 7 (3/4), pp. 91–120, 2 pls.

HALL, A. 1940. Catalogue of the Lepidoptera Rhopalocera (Butterflies) of British Guiana. *Brit. Guiana Dept. Agric. Ent. Bull.* (3), 88 pp.

HEMMING, F. 1967. The generic Names of the Butterflies and their Type-species. *Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist.* (Entomol.) Suppl. vol. 9, 509 pp.

LAMAS, G. 1969. Lista de ropalóceros (Lepidoptera) peruanos citados en la obra "Die Gross-Schmetterlinge der Erde" de Adalbert Seitz. *Biota* (Lima) vol. 7 (58), 265–328

LEWIS, H. L. 1973. *Butterflies of the World.* xvi pp., 208 pls., pp. [2], 209–312. 4°. (Harrap) London.

LICHY, R. 1936. Dos lepidópteros nuevos para Venezuela. *Bol. Soc. venezolana de Ciencias nat.* vol. 3 (24), pp. 204–209, 2 figs.

——— 1938. Lepidópteros nuevos para Venezuela. *Ibid.* vol. 4 (32), pp. 266–278, 1 pl.

ORTIZ, I. 1967. *Mariposas y "Taras" de Santiago de León de Caracas. Sus Inter-relaciones en Algunos Aspectos Humanos de la Salud (1567–1967).* Caracas, Sociedad Venezolana de Salud Pública. 79 pp. 38 figs.

TELLO, J. 1968. *Historia Natural de Caracas.* Caracas, Consejo Municipal del Distrito Federal. 326 pp.

ZIKÁN, J. F. & ZIKÁN, N. 1968. Inseto-Fauna do Itatiaia e da Mantiqueira. III. Lepidoptera. *Pesquisa agropecuaria brasileira* vol. 3, pp. 45–109.

CEROPLESIS SERVILLE, 1835 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2180

By R. C. Marinoni (*Universidade Federal do Parana, Brazil*)

Serville, 1835 (*Ann. Soc. entomol. France,* vol. 4, p. 93) described the genus *Ceroplesis* and included four species (among them *Lamia trifasciata* Fabricius, 1775, *Syst. Entomol.,* p. 174, and *Lamia aethiops* Fabricius, 1775, ibid.). Dejean, 1835, *Cat. Coléop. Comte Dejean,* livr. 4, p. 342, erected the genus *Diastocera* with a single species, *Lamia trifasciata* Fabricius, which is therefore the type species by monotypy.

2. Thomson, 1860, *Essai Classif. Fam. Cérambycides,* p. 92, followed Dejean's concept and, after redescribing *Diastocera,* stated: 'Genre fondé sur *Ceroplesis trifasciata* Fabr. *Syst. Eleuth.* II p. 297 ... Espèce: *D. trifasciata* Fabr. (*Lamia*) *Ent. Syst.* II, 281, 55'. In the same paper, p. 95, he listed under *Ceroplesis* the other three species originally cited by Serville.

3. However, in 1864 Thomson (*Syst. Cerambycidarum,* p. 69) recognised *D. trifasciata* Fab. '(*Ent. Syst.* II p. 281, no. 55, Senegal — *Syst. Eleut.* II, p. 297, no. 84)' as type species of *Diastocera,* and then designated in the next entry on the same page *C. trifasciata* Fab. '(*Syst. Eleut.* II, p. 297, no. 24) (*Lamia*)' as type species of *Ceroplesis.* The bibliographic references differ only in the number cited for Fabricius's species — *Syst. Eleut.* nos. 24 and 84. Thomson's references are identical to those of Serville. This is an error. The correct number is 84, not 24. Hence the same species was indicated by Thomson as type of both *Diastocera* and *Ceroplesis.*

4. The sense in which *Ceroplesis* was used by Dejean, 1835, by Thomson, 1860, and is now used, excludes *L. trifasciata.* The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(a) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for *Ceroplesis* Serville, 1835, and having done so to designate *Lamia aethiops* Fabricius, 1775, as type species of that genus;

(b) to place the generic name *Ceroplesis* Serville, 1835 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (a) above, *Lamia aethiops* Fabricius, 1775, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(c) to place the specific name *aethiops* Fabricius, 1775, as published in the binomen *Lamia aethiops,* (specific name of type species of *Ceroplesis* Serville, 1835) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

RALLUS TABUENSIS GMELIN, 1789 (AVES): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *RALLUS NIGRA* (*sic*) MILLER, 1784. Z.N.(S.)2276

By Murray D. Bruce (*10 Buckra Street, Turramurra, New South Wales 2074, Australia*), D. T. Holyoak (*Dept. of Geography, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, England*), and J.-C. Thibault (*15 Rue Daubenton, Paris, 75005, France*)

This application is designed to preserve the long established and generally used specific name of *Rallus tabuensis* Gmelin, 1789, *Syst. Nat.* 1(2), p. 717 (based on the Tabuan Rail of Latham, 1785, *Gen. Syn. Bds* 3, p. 135, from Tongatabu Island), a widespread crake from the Philippines to New Zealand and south east Polynesia. It is currently placed in the genus *Porzana* (see Olson, 1973, *Wilson Bull.* vol. 85, pp. 381–416) and it is known by the English name of the Spotless Crake.

2. Sherborn & Iredale (1921, *Ibis* (11) vol. 3, pp. 302–309) pointed out that the name *Rallus nigra* Miller, 1784, *Var. Sub. Nat. Hist.* 9, pl. 50, from the island of Tahiti, antedates *Rallus tabuensis* Gmelin, 1789, but they did not know whether there might be some difference between birds from Tongatabu and Tahiti. Lysaght (1956, *Bull. Br. Orn. Cl.* vol. 76, pp. 97–98) commented that Amadon, who used the name *tabuensis* (1942, *Am. Mus. Novit.* 1175, pp. 10–11), had been unable to detect any differences between Tongatabu and Tahiti birds, which he classified in the same (nominate) subspecies as *Porzana tabuensis tabuensis* (Gmelin, 1789). As a result Lysaght advocated the adoption of Miller's name, *nigra,* for the species. We have also examined specimens from Tongatabu, Tahiti and from other localities in the Tonga and Society Islands and found no morphological differences between them.

3. The specific name *nigra,* based on *Rallus nigra* Miller, 1784, has been used as *Porzana nigra* (Miller, 1784) in place of *Porzana tabuensis* (Gmelin, 1789) only five times (see Appendix 1). The name was originally published in the form *Rallus nigra,* although *Rallus niger* (masculine) would have been correct. Subsequent authors have not corrected the spelling because transferred to the genus *Porzana* the feminine ending becomes suitable.

4. Peters (1934, *Checklist Bds World* Volume 2, p. 188) tentatively placed *Rallus nigra* Miller, 1784 in the synonymy of *Porzana atra* North, 1908, the endemic crake of Henderson Island, which he placed in the monotypic genus *Nesophylax.* Lysaght (1956, *op. cit.*) has shown that Peters' description of Miller's plate was inaccurate in some import-

ant details, apparently because he examined the second edition of Miller's plates (1796, *Cimelia Physica*) in which the hand-colouring is less accurate than in the first edition. More importantly, Peters evidently overlooked the locality 'Otaheite' [= Tahiti] given in the interleaved text when he stated that Miller gave no locality. In view of the locality, there can be little doubt that *Rallus nigra* Miller, 1784 is different from the endemic Henderson Island Crake, *Porzana atra* North, 1908, and that it is the same as *Porzana tabuensis* (Gmelin, 1789).

5. With the few exceptions noted in paragraph 3 above and in Appendix 1, the Spotless Crake has been known overwhelmingly, and is currently known, by the name *Porzana tabuensis* (Gmelin, 1789) (see Appendix 2). This name is used in the literature listed in Appendix 2, selecting publications chiefly from the last fifty years, but also including a few major older works that are or were relied on for nomenclature by zoologists.

6. While *Porzana nigra* (Miller, 1784), based on *Rallus nigra* Miller, 1784, has priority over *Porzana tabuensis* (Gmelin, 1789), based on *Rallus tabuensis* Gmelin, 1789, its adoption would disturb the stability and universality of usage of *Rallus tabuensis* Gmelin and cause confusion. Peters' (incorrect) attribution of *Rallus nigra* Miller, 1784 to *Porzana atra* North, 1908 in the generally standard *Checklist of the Birds of the World* would aggravate the confusion if Miller's specific name were to replace *Porzana tabuensis* (Gmelin, 1789), the identity of which has not been in dispute. Article 79(b) allows a junior synonym to be conserved in the interest of promoting stability and universality of usage or avoiding confusion. Suppression of Miller's name is preferable to a Ruling that Gmelin's name should be given precedence when they are regarded as synonyms because the birds of Tahiti are now well known and it is extremely improbable that *nigra* could apply to some form other than the nominate *tabuensis*. In accordance with Article 80, *Rallus tabuensis* Gmelin, 1789, the currently used name, must be maintained as the valid name until the decision of the Commission is published.

7. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *nigra* Miller, 1784, as published in the binomen *Rallus nigra*, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the specific name *tabuensis* Gmelin, 1789, as published in the binomen *Rallus tabuensis*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *nigra* Miller, 1784, as published in the binomen *Rallus nigra* and suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

APPENDIX 1

Books and papers using the name *nigra* Miller, 1874 for the Spotless Crake:

SHERBORN & IREDALE 1921. *Ibis* (11) vol. 3, pp. 302–309.
MATHEWS 1927. *Syst. Av. Australas.* vol. 1, pp. 92–93.
BERLIOZ 1934. *Bull. Mus. natn. Hist. Nat., Paris (2)* vol. 6, p. 340.
LYSAGHT 1956. *Bull. Br. Orn. Cl.* vol. 76, pp. 97–98.
LYSAGHT 1959. *Bull. Br. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Hist. ser.* vol. 1, p. 302.

APPENDIX 2

Recent and major books and papers using the name *tabuensis* Gmelin, 1789 for the Spotless Crake:

GRAY 1871. *Handlist Gen. Species Bds* vol. 3, p. 63.
SHARPE 1894. *Cat. Bds Brit. Mus.* vol. 23, pp. 93, 111–112.
SHARPE 1899. *Handlist Gen. Species Bds* vol. 1, p. 102.
MURPHY 1924. *Am. Mus. Novit.* No. 124, pp. 4–7.
CAYLEY 1931. *What bird is that?* pp. 5, 241.
PETERS 1934. *Checklist Bds World* vol. 2, p. 187.
ADAMSON 1939. *Bull. Bernice P. Bishop Mus.* vol. 159, p. 64.
MAYR 1941. *List of New Guinea birds*, p. 24.
AMADON 1942. *Am. Mus. Novit.* No. 1175, pp. 10–11.
MAYR 1945. *Bds Southwest Pacific*, pp. 60, 111, 128, 157, 179, 203, 219.
DELACOUR & MAYR 1946. *Bds Philippines*, p. 64.
MAYR & GILLIARD 1954 *Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist.* vol. 103, pp. 318, 326, 335.
GREENWAY 1958. *Extinct and vanishing bds World.*, p. 219.
WILLIAMS 1960. *Ibis* vol. 102, pp. 61–62, 66.
DELACOUR 1966. *Guide des oiseaux de la Nouvelle Calédonie*, p. 66.
FALLA, SIBSON & TURBOTT 1966. *Field guide bds New Zealand*, p. 108.
RAND & GILLIARD 1967. *Handbook New Guinea Bds*, p. 111.
SOPER 1969. *Notornis* vol. 16, pp. 219–220.
HADDEN 1970. *Notornis* vol. 17, pp. 200–213.
DUPONT 1971. *Philippine Bds*, p. 69.
SLATER *et al.* 1971. *Field guide Australian Bds. Non-Passerines*, p. 271.
FRASER 1972. *Notornis* vol. 19, pp. 87–88.
THIBAULT 1973. *Alauda* vol. 41, pp. 112, 302, 314.
MACDONALD 1973. *Bds of Australia*, p. 138.
KING 1973. *Wilson Bull.* vol. 85, p. 98.
THIBAULT & THIBAULT 1973. *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 43, p. 62.
HOLYOAK 1974. *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 44, p. 25.
LACAN & MOUGIN 1974. *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 44, pp. 231, 272.
THIBAULT 1974. *C.r. Acad. Sci., Paris, Sér. D.* No. 278, p. 2477.
HOLYOAK 1975. *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 45, pp. 215, 227.
PETITOT & PETITOT 1975. *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 45, p. 83.
CONDON 1975. *Checklist Bds Australia. Vol. 1*, p. 103.
JOHNSON 1976. *Notornis* vol. 23, p. 357.
RIPLEY 1977. *Rails of the World*, pp. 230–231.
HOLYOAK & THIBAULT (in press). *Bull. Mus. natn. Hist. nat., Paris.*
BRUCE (in press). *Checklist Bds Wallacea.*

ZEUGOPHORA KUNZE, 1818 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2405

By Hans Silfverberg (*Zoological Museum, University of Helsingfors, Helsingfors, Finland*)

In this application it is proposed that the generally used generic name *Zeugophora* Kunze, 1818, in the family CHRYSOMELIDAE, be preserved by the suppression of its unused senior synonym *Auchenia* Thunberg, 1792.

2. The genus *Auchenia* was introduced by Thunberg (1792, pp. 95 and 116), who named three species as being members of it: *Auchenia duodecimpunctata* (*Chrysomela 12-punctata* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 376) on p. 95; *Auchenia subspinosa* (*Crioceris subspinosa* Fabricius, 1781, p. 155) and *Auchenia melanopa* (*Chrysomela melanopus* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 376), both on p. 116. In subsequent years some zoologists used the name *Auchenia,* but most did not.

3. Latreille (1829) gave a diagnosis of *Auchenia,* mentioning only the species *Crioceris subspinosa* F., but he did not call it the type, so this mention cannot be considered to be a type designation. Westwood (1838) named *Chrysomela quadrimaculata* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 376 as the type species of *Auchenia* and Hope (1840) did so as well. As *C. quadrimaculata* was not one of the species originally included in *Auchenia* by Thunberg (1792) both Westwood's and Hope's designations were invalid under Article 69(a) of the Code. Duponchel & Chevrolat (in d'Orbigny, 1842) mentioned *Crioceris subspinosa* Fabricius, 1781 as the type species, and this is the valid designation.

4. The genus *Zeugophora* was described by Kunze (1818, p. 71) with two species included, *Z. subspinosa* and *Z. flavicollis* (*Auchenia flavicollis* Marsham, 1802, p. 217). Westwood (1838) designated *Crioceris subspinosa* Fabricius, 1781 as type species of this genus.

5. *Auchenia* and *Zeugophora* are objective synonyms and according to the Law of Priority *Auchenia* should take precedence. However *Auchenia* has not been used as a valid generic name for more than a century, whilst *Zeugophora* has been in universal use, e.g. by Crowson (1946), Lindroth (1960), Arnett (1962), Gressitt & Kimoto (1963), Medvedev & Shapiro (1965), Mohr (1966), Iablokoff-Khnzorian (1966), Berti & Rapilly (1973), Lopatin (1977) and Pope (1977). Furthermore *Zeugophora* is the base for the subfamily name ZEUGOPHORINAE. Replacing *Zeugophora* with *Auchenia* would definitely not be in the best interests of stability of the nomenclature.

6. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Auchenia* Thunberg, 1792, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Zeugophora* Kunze, 1818 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation, *Crioceris subspinosa* Fabricius, 1781, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *subspinosa* Fabricius, 1781, as published in the binomen *Crioceris subspinosa* (specific name of the type species of *Zeugophora* Kunze, 1818) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Auchenia* Thunberg, 1792, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

ARNETT, R. H. 1962. *The beetles of the United States (6).* Washington, D.C., pp. 851–1112.

BERTI, N. & RAPILLY, M. 1973. Contribution à la faune de l'Iran. Voyages de Mm. R. Naviaux et M. Rapilly (Col. Chrysomelidae). *Ann. Soc. entomol. France (N.S.)* vol. 9, pp. 861–894.

CROWSON, R. A. 1946. A revision of the genera of the Chrysomelid group Sagrinae (Coleoptera). *Trans. r. Entomol. Soc. London* vol. 97, pp. 75–115.

FABRICIUS, J. C. 1781. *Species Insectorum, Vol. 1.* Hamburgi et Kilonii, pp. 1–552.

GRESSITT, J. L. & KIMOTO, S. 1961. The Chrysomelidae (Coleopt.) of China and Korea. Part 1. *Pacific Insects Monogr.* vol. 1, pp. 1–299.

HOPE, F. W. 1840. *The coleopterist's manual,* vol. III. London, pp. 1–191.

IABLOKOFF-KHNZORIAN, S. M. 1966. Considérations sur l'édéage des Chrysomelidae et son importance phylogénique. *L'Entomologiste* vol. 22, pp. 115–136.

KUNZE, G. 1818. Zeugophora (Jochträger), eine neue Käfergattung. *Neue Schr. naturf. Ges. Halle* vol. 2(4), pp. 71–76.

LATREILLE, P. 1829, in Cuvier, *Le règne animal.* 2 ed., vol. 5. Paris. pp. 1–556.

LINDROTH, C. H. 1960 (ed.). *Catalogus Coleopterorum Fennoscandiae et Daniae.* Lund, pp. 1–476.

LOPATIN, I. K. 1977. Žuky-listoedy Srednej Azii i Kazahstana. *Opred. faune SSSR* vol. 113, pp. 1–270.

MEDVEDEV, L. N. & SHAPIRO, D. S. 1965. 76. Sem. Chrysomelidae — Listoedy. *Opred. faune SSSR* vol. 89, pp. 419–474.

MOHR, K. H. 1966. *88. Fam. Chrysomelidae,* in Freude, Harde & Lohse, *Die Käfer Mitteleuropas,* vol. 9, pp. 95–280.

D'ORBIGNY, C. 1842. *Dictionnaire universel d'histoire naturelle*, vol. 2, Paris, pp. 1–795.

POPE, R. D. 1977 in Kloet & Hincks. A checklist of British Insects (ed. 2), part 3. Coleoptera and Strepsiptera. *Handb. Ident. Br. Insects* vol. 11(3), pp. 1–105.

THUNBERG, C. P. 1792. Descriptiones insectorum svecicorum. *Nova Acta Upsala* vol. 5, pp. 85–119.

WESTWOOD, J. O. 1838. *An introduction to the modern classification of insects*, vol. 1, part 1, (*Synopsis of the genera of British insects*). London, pp. 1–48.

INDEX TO AUTHORS

	Page
Austin, A.D.	70
Bacescu, M.	58
Bailey, R.M.	167
Baird, D.	184
Balk, C. Lochman	70
Bolton, B.	70
Boucek, Z.	70
Broadley, D.G.	189
Brothers, D.J.	72
Bruce, M.D.	249
Chiszar, D.	225
Clarke, B.T.	114
Coan, E.V.	65
Cooper, M.R.	228
Cowan, C.F.	41, 243, 245
Cutler, B.	19
DeBach, P.	74
Dubois, A.	114, 198
Ferguson, N.D.M.	70
Fitton, M.G.	70
Fitzgerald, K.T.	165
Fletcher, D.S.	231
Froeschner, R.C.	65
Gauld, I.D.	70
Guillette, L.J., Jr.	165
Gurney, A.B.	205
Groves, C.P.	117
Heppell, D.	221, 237
Holthuis, L.B.	56, 58, 73, 197
Holyoak, D.T.	249
Huddleston, T.	70
Kafanov, A.I.	122
Kensley, B.	163
Lanham, U.N.	62
LaSalle, J.	74
Legrand, P.	20
Loveridge, A. (deceased)	62
Marinoni, R.C.	248
Melville, R.V. (Secretary)	15, 19, 71, 179, 204, 220, 240, 241
Michener, C.D.	207
Mikkola, K.	102
Mockford, E.L.	124
Moore, T.E.	124
Morère, J.-J.	114
Morgan, R.E.	221
Napier, P.H.	117
Narchi, W.	188
Noyes, J.S.	70
Nussbaum, R.A.	124
Nye, I.W.B.	231
Ossiannilsson, F.	119
Petit, R.E.	173
Pont, A.C.	106
Quednau, F.W.	60
Quinlan, J.	70
Rao, B.R. Subba	70
Rasmussen, J.B.	209
Reiskind, J.	43
Ride, W.D.L.	140
Roth, L.M.	205
Rudman, W.B.	211
Ryckman, R.E.	65
Sabrosky, C.W.	15
Savage, J.M.	195
Sieg, J.	58
Silfverberg, H.	252
Skevington, D.	23
Smith, H.M.	62, 165, 225
Smith, R.B.	225
Southwood, T.R.E.	133
Stewart, D.J.	167
Stimson, A.F.	17, 114, 195, 196, 209
Stroyan, H.L.G.	53
Stubblefield, C.J.	70
Thibault, J.-C.	249
Thompson, R.T.	47
Underwood, G.L.	17, 195
Vecht, J. van der	111
Vervoort, W.	56
Whittington, H.B.	176
Zimmerman, E.C.	45

LIST OF DECISIONS IN THIS VOLUME

Opinion		*Page*
1239	*Attelabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Coleoptera): type species designated	25
1240	HESPERIIDAE Latreille, 1809 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): added to Official List	27
1241	CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898 and PALAEOTHENTIDAE Sinclair, 1906 (Mammalia): conserved	29
1242	*Cataphryxus* Shiino, 1936 (Crustacea, Isopoda): conserved	33
1243	*Erinaceus dauuricus* Sundevall, 1842 (Mammalia, Insectivora): conserved	35
1244	*Stethaspis* Hope, 1837 (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae): designation of type species	37
1245	*Linyphia tenebricola* Wider, 1834 (Arachnida): to be interpreted in the sense of Kulczynski, 1887	39
1246	*Herpetodryas margaritiberus* Schlegel, 1837 (Reptilia, Serpentes): conserved	75
1247	*Dactylopius* Costa, (Nov. 1829) and *Pseudococcus* Westwood, 1840 (Insecta, Homoptera): designation of type species	77
1248	*Lethocerus* Mayr, 1853 (Insecta, Hemiptera): conserved	81
1249	*Toxostoma crissale* ruled to be the correct original spelling of the name first published as *Toxostoma dorsalis* Baird, 1858 (Aves)	83
1250	*Gyrohypnus* Samouelle, 1819, ex Leach Ms, *Xantholinus* Dejean, 1821, ex Dahl and *Othius* Stephens, 1829, ex Leach Ms (Insecta, Coleoptera): type species designated for these genera	85
1251	*Dicranodonta* Woods, 1899 (Bivalvia, Cucullaeidae): designation of type species	88
1252	*Sterna cerulea* Bennett, 1840 (Aves): conserved	90
1253	*Chromodoris californiensis* Bergh, 10 May 1879 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): conserved	92
1254	Prohysteroceras Spath, 1921 and *Neokentroceras* Spath, 1921 (Cephalopoda, Ammonoidea): designation of type species	94
1255	*Lespesia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863 (Diptera, Tachinidae): designation of type species	97
1256	*Sorex dsinezumi* Temminck, 1843 (Mammalia, Insectovora): ruled to be a correct original spelling	147
1257	*Tipula ferruginea* Fabricius, 1805 (Insecta, Diptera): conserved	149
1258	*Ochthera exsculpta* Loew, 1862 (Insecta, Diptera): placed on the Official List	151
1259	*Ogygiocaris* Angelin, 1854 and *Ogygites* Tromelin & Lebesconte, 1876 (Trilobita): conserved	153
1260	*Orthunga* Dohrn, 1859 (Insecta, Hemiptera): added to the Official List	157
1261	*Chuangia* Walcott, 1911, conserved; *Shantungia* Walcott 1905, added to Official List (Trilobita)	160
1262	*Cancer vocans major* Herbst, 1782 (Crustacea, Decapoda): neotype designated under the plenary powers	200
1263	*Prototomus viverrinus* Cope, 1874 (Mammalia): refusal to designate a neotype under the plenary powers	202

NAMES PLACED ON OFFICIAL LISTS AND INDEXES IN DECISIONS PUBLISHED IN VOLUME 40

Official List of Specific Names in Zoology

adriaticus, Epiphrixus, Nierstrasz & Brender à Brandis, 1932
anisotae, Achaetoneura, Webber, 1930
aratae, Palaeothentes, Ameghino, 1887
batia, Ptychoparia?, Walcott, 1905
benniworthensis, Cucullaea, Kelly, 1978
californiensis, Chromodoris, Bergh, 10 May, 1879
cerulea, Sterna, Bennett, 1840
coccus, Dactylopius, Costa, (Nov. 1829)
columnaris, Decastis, Ameghino, 1891
comma, Papilio, Linnaeus, 1758
crissale, Toxostoma, Baird, May 1858
curvicornu, Neokentroceras, Spath, 1922
dauuricus, Erinaceus, Sundevall, 1842
desmaresti, Ogygia, Brongniart *in* Brongniart & Desmarest, 1822
dilatatus, Trilobus, Brünnich, 1781
dsinezumi, Sorex, Temminck, 1843
exsculpta, Ochthera, Loew, 1862
fakir, Belostoma, Gistel, [1848]
ferruginea, Tipula, Fabricius, 1805
fracticornis, Staphylinus, O.F. Müller, 1776
fulgidus, Staphylinus, Fabricius, 1787
fuliginosus, Hyracodon, Tomes, 1863
linearis, Staphylinus, Olivier, 1794
longispinus, Dactylopius, Targioni-Tozzetti, 1867
margaritiferus, Herpetodryas, Schlegel, 1837
meridionalis, Abderites, Ameghino, 1887
nitens, Curculio, Scopoli, 1763
primus, Epiphryxus, Shiino, 1934
punctulatus, Staphylinus, Goeze, 1777
sibiricus, Erinaceus, Erxleben, 1777
spinifera, Shantungia, Walcott, 1905
suturalis, Melolontha Fabricius, 1775
tangeri, Gelasimus, Eydoux, 1835
tenebricola, Linyphia, Wider, 1834
typica, Garzonia, Ameghino, 1891
viverrinus, Prototomus, Cope, 1874
wahlbergi, Emesa, Stål. 1855
wordiei, Prohysteroceras, Spath, 1922

Official List of Generic Names in Zoology

Abderites Ameghino, 1887
Attelabus Linnaeus, 1758
Caenolestes Thomas, 1895
Cataphryxus Shiino, 1936
Chuangia Walcott, 1911
Dactylopius Costa, (Nov. 1829)
Decastis Ameghino, 1891
Dicranodonta Woods, 1899
Epiphrixus Nierstrasz & Brender à Brandis, 1932
Garzonia Ameghino, 1891
Gauropterus C.G. Thomson, 1869
Gyrohypnus Samouelle, 1819
Hesperia Fabricius, 1793
Lespesia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863
Lethocerus Mayr, 1853
Neokentroceras Spath, 1921
Ogygiocaris Angelin, 1854
Ogygites Tromelin & Lebesconte, 1876
Orthunga Dohrn, 1859
Othius Stephens, 1829
Palaeothentes Ameghino, 1887
Prohysteroceras Spath, 1921
Pseudococcus Westwood, 1840
Shantungia Walcott, 1905
Stethaspis Hope, 1837
Xantholinus Dejean, 1821

Official List of Family Group Names in Zoology

ABDERITINAE Ameghino, 1889
CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898
DACTYLOPIIDAE Signoret, 1875
DECASTIDAE Ameghino, 1893
GARZONIIDAE Ameghino, 1891
HESPERIIDAE Latreille, 1809
OGYGIOCARIDINAE Raymond, 1913
PALAEOTHENTINAE Sinclair, 1906
PSEUDOCOCCIDAE Cockerell, 1905

Official List of Available Works in Zoology

O.G. Costa, Nov. 1829: *Fauna del Regno di Napoli. Famiglia de' cocciniglíferi o de' gallinsetti, Emitteri, Napoli.*

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology

adonidum, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1767
australis, Sterna, Gmelin, 1789
chiametla, Coluber, Shaw, 1802
coffeae, Pediculus, Linnaeus, 1767
dorsalis, Toxostoma, Baird, May 1958
ferruginea, Tipula, Scopoli, 1763
glauca, Chromodoris, Bergh, 31 March, 1879
kinczumi, Sorex, Temminck, 1843
kinezumi, Sorex, Temminck, 1843
platydactylus, Gelasimus, H. Milne-Edwards, 1837
uka, Cancer, Shaw & Nodder, 1803

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology

Diaprosteci Costa, 1828
Epiphryxus Shiino, 1934
Iccius Dohrn, 1859
Iliastus Gistel, [1848]
Jccius, Dohrn, 1859
Ogygia Brongniart, 1817
Ogygia Hübner, [1821]
Schantungia Lorenz, 1906
Shangtungia Walcott, 1905

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family Group Names in Zoology

OGYGINAE Raymond, 1913
OGYGIOCARINAE Raymond, 1913

INDEX TO KEY NAMES

	Page
Abderites Ameghino, 1887 (Opinion 1241)	29
ABDERITINAE Ameghino, 1889 (Opinion 1241)	30
acervorum, Apis, Linnaeus, 1758	208
Actinodoris Ehrenberg, 1831	216
adamsi, Cuspidaria (Rhinoclama), Morgan & Heppell, 1981	223
adonidum, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1767 (Opinion 1247)	77
adriaticus, Epiphrixus, Nierstrasz & Brender à Brandis, 1932 (Opinion 1242)	33
Aetheius Hübner, [1819]	246
aethiops, Lamia, Fabricius, 1775	248
alastoroides, Odynerus, Saussure, 1853	111
albidus, Agonioneurus, Westwood, 1837	70
aldrovandi, Panopea, Ménard de la Groye, 1807	182
aleyrodis, Trichaporus, Mercet, 1930	73
Allygidius Ribaut, 1948	119
Allygus Fieber, 1872	119
Anchiopella Reed, 1907	230
Ancistroceroides Saussure, 1855	111
anisotae, Achaetoneura, Webber, 1930 (Opinion 1255)	97
Anolis Daudin, 1802	15, 195
ANUROPIDAE Stebbing, 1893	58
Anuropoda Bacescu, 1980	58
ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu, 1980	58
ANUROPODINAE Calman, 1907	58
Anuropus Beddard, 1866	58
aratae, Palaeothentes, Ameghino, 1887 (Opinion 1241)	29
archytas, Papilio, Stoll, [1787]	246
arcularia, Buccinum, Linnaeus, 1758	239
Astacilla Cordiner, 1793	163
atomaria, Cicada, Fabricius, 1794	119
Attelabus Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1239)	25
Auchenia Thunberg, 1792	253
auratus, Anolis, Daudin, 1802	195
australis, Sterna, Gmelin, 1789 (Opinion 1252)	90
axiochus, Anteros, Hewitson, [1867]	246
aygula, Simia, Linnaeus, 1758	117

bagre, Silurus, Linnaeus, 1766	167
BAGRIDAE Bleeker, 1858	170
Bagrus Bosc, 1816	167
Bainella Rennie, 1930	228
bajad, Silurus, Forsskål, 1775	167
batia, Ptychoparia?, Walcott, 1905 (Opinion 1261)	160
bellatrix, Phalaena, Stoll, 1780	233
benniworthensis, Cucullaea, Kelly, 1978 (Opinion 1251)	88

	Page
betulella, Calaphis, Walsh, 1862	60
blumenbachii, Calymena, Brongniart *in* Desmarest, 1817	177
Boiga Fitzinger, 1826	209
bokkeveldensis, Bainella, Rennie, 1930	209
branchiatus, Anuropus, Beddard, 1886	58
bullaris, Lacerta, Linnaeus, 1758	15, 18, 195
Caecilia Linnaeus, 1758	124
CAECILIIDAE Gray, 1825	124
CAECILIINI Kolbe, 1880	124
CAECILIONIDAE Kolbe, 1880	126
Caecilius Curtis, 1837	124
Caenolestes Thomas, 1895 (Opinion 1241)	29
CAENOLESTIDAE Trouessart, 1898 (Opinion 1241)	29
Caeparia Stål, 1877	205
calabarica, Pseudoplontia, Plötz, 1870	41
CALAPHIDINI Oestlund, 1918	61
Calaphis Walsh, 1862	60
californiensis, Chromodoris, Bergh, 10 May 1879 (Opinion 1253)	92
CALLAPHIDINAE Börner, 1952	61
Callaphis Walker, 1870	60
Calymena Desmarest, 1817	177
Calymene Brongniart, 1822 *in* Brongniart & Desmarest, 1822	176
CALYMENIDAE Milne Edwards, 1840	176
capillaceus, Pectunculus, da Costa, 1778	183
capitata, Larentia, Herrich-Schäffer, 1839	102
carolinensis, Anolis, Voigt, 1832	17
Cataphryxus Shiino, 1936 (Opinion 1242)	33
Ceroplesis Serville, 1835	248
cerulea, Sterna, Bennett, 1840 (Opinion 1252)	90
Chaetopterus Cuvier, 1830	241
Chelydra Schweigger, 1812	226
chiametla, Coluber, Shaw, 1802 (Opinion 1246)	75
CHROMODORIDIDAE Bergh, 1892	211
Chromodoris Alder & Hancock, 1855	211
chrysoscelis, Hyla femoralis, Cope, 1880	165
Chuangia Walcott, 1911 (Opinion 1261)	70, 160
coccus, Dactylopius, Costa, (Nov. 1829) (Opinion 1247)	77
coffeae, Pediculus, Linnaeus, 1767 (Opinion 1247)	77
columnaris, Decastis, Ameghino, 1891 (Opinion 1241)	29
comma, Papilio, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1240)	27
coracina, Phalaena, Esper, 1805	102
cordofanus, Lethocerus, Mayr, 1853 (Opinion 1248)	81
Crinodes Herrich-Schäffer, 1855	231
crissale, Toxostoma, Baird, May 1858 (Opinion 1249)	83
cruentus, Odynerus, Saussure, 1855	111
cupratus, Eurhin, Illiger, 1807	50
curculionoides, Attelabus, Linnaeus, 1767 (Opinion 1239)	25
curvicornu, Neokentroceras, Spath, 1922 (Opinion 1254)	94
cyparissa, Papilio, Cramer, [1775]	244
Cyrtodaria Reuss, 1801	180

	Page
DACTYLOPIIDAE Signoret, 1875 (Opinion 1247)	78
Dactylopius Costa, (Nov. 1829) (Opinion 1247)	77
DACTYLOPODIINAE Lang, 1936	57
Dactylopusia Norman, 1903	56
DACTYLOPUSIINAE Lang, 1936	57
dauuricus, Erinaceus, Sundevall, 1842 (Opinion 1243)	35
DECASTIDAE Ameghino, 1893 (Opinion 1241)	29
Decastis Ameghino, 1891 (Opinion 1241)	29
Dendrobates Wagler, 1830	197
DENDROBATIDAE Cope, 1865	197
desmaresti, Ogygia, Brongniart, *in* Brongniart & Desmarest, 1822 (Opinion 1259)	153
Diaprosteci Costa, 1828 (Opinion 1247)	77
Dicranodonta Woods, 1899 (Opinion 1251)	88
Dictyonema Hall, 1851	20
dilatatus, Trilobus, Brünnich, 1781 (Opinion 1259)	153
dorsalis, Toxostoma, Baird, May 1858 (Opinion 1249)	83
Dromophis Peters, 1869	189
dsinezumi, Sorex, Temminck, 1843 (Opinion 1256)	147
Epiphrixus Nierstrasz & Brender à Brandis, 1932 (Opinion 1242)	33
Eremiophilus Fitzinger, 1843	114
Euphaedra Hübner [1819]	243
Eurhin Illiger, 1807	45
EURHININI Lacordaire, 1866	51
Eurhinus Illiger, 1807	50
Eurhinus Schönherr, 1825	49
Eurhynchus Berthold, 1827	49
EURHYNCHINAE Lacordaire, 1863	51
Eurhuncus Kirby, *in* Kirby & Spence, 1828	45
exoleta, Venus, Linnaeus, 1758	183
exsculpta, Ochthera, Loew, 1862 (Opinion 1258)	151
fakir, Belostoma, Gistel, [1848], (Opinion 1248)	81
fascicularis, Simia, Raffles, 1821	117
fenestratus, Caecilius, Curtis, 1837	124
ferruginea, Tipula, Scopoli, 1763 (Opinion 1257)	149
ferruginea, Tipula, Fabricius, 1805 (Opinion 1257)	149
festucae, Myzus, Theobald, 1917	53
fimbriatus, Stellio, Schneider, 1792	63
flabelliformis, Gorgonia, Eichwald, 1840	19
fracticornis, Staphylinus, O.F. Müller, 1776 (Opinion 1250)	85
francispori, Anuropoda, Bacescu, 1980	58
fulgidus, Staphylinus, Fabricius, 1787 (Opinion 1250)	86
fuliginosus, Hyracodon, Tomes, 1863 (Opinion 1241)	29
fuscopterus, Psocus, Latreille, 1799	125
Galeopsomyia Girault, 1916	73
Garzonia Ameghino, 1891 (Opinion 1241)	29
GARZONIIDAE Ameghino, 1891 (Opinion 1241)	30

	Page
Gauropterus C.G. Thomson, 1869 (Opinion 1250)	85
glauca, Chromodoris, Bergh, 31 March 1879 (Opinion 1253)	92
Glossodoris Ehrenberg, 1831	211
Glycimeris Lamarck, 1799	179
Glycimeris Lamarck, 1801	183
glycymeris, Arca, Linnaeus, 1758	183
Glycymeris da Costa, 1778	179
GLYCYMERIDIDAE Stewart, 1930	183
Gonophlebia Felder, June 1870	41
grangeri, Pachycephalosaurus, Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943	186
gulosa, Formica, Fabricius, 1775	44
Gyrohypnus Samouelle, 1819 (Opinion 1250)	85
hanleyanus, Donax, Philippi, 1847	188
Hemilucilia Brauer, 1895	109
Hesperia Fabricius, 1793 (Opinon 1240)	27
HESPERIIDAE Latreille, 1809 (Opinion 1240)	27
Heterolaophonte Lang, 1948	56
hirtata, Phalaena, Fabricius, 1794	102
hilairea, Donax, Guérin, 1832	188
Hylambates Duméril, 1853	114
Hypselodoris Stimpson, 1855	211
Ibiba Gray, 1825	209
Iccius Dohrn, 1859 (Opinion 1260)	157
Iliastus Gistel, [1848] (Opinion 1248)	81
irregularis, Coluber, Merrem *in* Bechstein, 1802	209
Jccius Dohrn, 1859 (Opinion 1260)	157
juglandis, Aphis, Goeze, 1778	60
Kassina Girard, 1853	114
kinczumi, Sorex, Temminck, 1843 (Opinion 1256)	147
kinezumi, Sorex, Temminck, 1843 (Opinion 1256)	147
laticarinata, Chelydra, Hay, 1916	226
Lespesia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863 (Opinion 1255)	97
Lethocerus Mayr, 1853 (Opinion 1248)	81
linearis, Staphylinus, Olivier, 1794 (Opinion 1250)	85
longicornis, Oniscus, J. Sowerby, 1805	163
longispinus, Dactylopius, Targioni-Tozzetti, 1867 (Opinion 1247)	77
lunifrontis, Cimex, Cooper, 1870	65
Luzonia Dall & Smith *in* Dall, 1890	223
Macropis Klug, 1809	207
maculatus, Hylambates, Duméril, 1853	114
magnificata, Doris, Quoy & Gaimard, 1832	216
margaritiferus, Herpetodryas, Schlegel, 1837 (Opinion 1246)	75
major, Cancer vocans, Herbst, 1782 (Opinion 1262)	200

Page

Megilla Fabricius, 1805 207
melleus, Trichoporus, Ashmead, 1904 73
meridionalis, Abderites, Amaghino, 1887 (Opinion 1241) . . 29
mixta, Cicada, Fabricius, 1794 119
monitor, Tupinambis, Daudin, 1802 196
mucronata, Hispa, Olivier, 1808 63
mutabile, Buccinum, Linnaeus, 1758 239
Mya Rondani, 1850 106
Myrmecia Fabricius, 1804 43
MYRMECIDES C.L. Koch, 1851 43
MYRMECIIDAE Emery, 1877 43
MYRMECIINAE Keyserling, (1891) 43
Myrmecium Latreille, 1824 43
MYRMECIUMIDAE C.L. Koch, 1851 44
myrmecophilum, Macrosiphum, Theobald, 1916 54
mytilaspidis, Aphytis, Le Baron, 1870 70

Najas Hübner, [1807] 244
NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916 237
Nassarius Duméril, 1806 239
Neadmete Habe, 1961 173
Neokentroceras Spath, 1921 (Opinion 1254) 94
nigra, Rallus, Miller, 1784 249
nitens, Curculio, Scopoli, 1763 (Opinion 1239) 25
Norops Wagler, 1830 195

oaxacae, Kinosternon, Pritchard, 1979 71
obscura, Goniodoris?, Stimpson, 1855 216
Ogygia Brongniart, 1817 (Opinion 1259) 153
Ogygia Hübner, [1821] (Opinion 1259) 154
OGYGINAE Raymond, 1913 (Opinion 1259) 154
OGYGIOCARIDINAE Jaanusson, 1959 (Opinion 1259) . . . 153
OGYGIOCARINAE Raymond, 1913 (Opinion 1259) 153
Ogygiocaris Angelin. 1854 (Opinion 1259) 153
Ogygites Tromelin & Lebesconte, 1876 (Opinion 1259) . . . 153
okutanii, Neadmete, Petit, 1974 173
orbicularis, Glycymeris, da Costa, 1778 180
ornatus, Tylosteus, Leidy, 1872 184
Orthunga Dohrn, 1859 (Opinion 1260) 157
osceola, Chelydra, Stejneger, 1918 225
Othius Stephens, 1829 (Opinion 1250) 85
otiosus, Attus, Hentz, 1846 19
Ourocnemis Baker, 1887 245

PACHYCEPHALOSAURIDAE Sternberg, 1945 186
Pachycephalosaurus Brown & Schlaikjer, 1943 184
Palaeothentes Ameghino, 1887 (Opinion 1241) 29
PALAEOTHENTIDAE Sinclair, 1906 (Opinion 1241) . . . 29
PALAEOTHENTINAE Sinclair, 1906 (Opinion 1241) . . . 29
pallida, Doris, Rüppell & Leuckart, 1830 or 1831 216
Panope Ménard de la Groye, 1807 180

	Page
Panopea Ménard de la Groye, 1807	179
Panaphis Kirkaldy, 1904	60
paradoxa, Globiceps, C. & R. Felder, 15 October, 1869	41
Paralastor Saussure, 1856	111
Pectunculus da Costa, 1778	183
Pectunculus Lamarck, 1799	183
pergamentaceus, Chaetopterus, Cuvier, 1830	241
Pero Herrich-Schäffer 1855	231
philippinensis, Neaera, Hinds, 1843	223
Philodendros Fitzinger, 1843	189
platydactylus, Gelasimus, H. Milne Edwards, 1837 (Opinion 1262)	200
posticata, Phalaena, Fabricius, 1794	102
praeornata, Dendrophis, Schlegel, 1837	190
primus, Epiphryxus, Shiino, 1934 (Opinion 1242)	33
Prohysteroceras Spath, 1921 (Opinion 1254)	94
PSEUDOCOCCIDAE Cockerell, 1905 (Opinion 1247)	78
Pseudococcus Westwood, 1840 (Opinion 1247)	77
Pseudopontia Plötz, 1870	41
Pterodoris Ehrenberg,1831	216
pulcher, Attus, Walckenaer, 1837	19
pulcherrimus, Phidippus, Keyserling, 1884	19
punctulatus, Staphylinus, Goeze, 1777 (Opinion 1250)	85
rectisectaria, Gonodontis, Herrich-Schäffer, [1855]	233
retiformis, Gorgonia, Hall, 1843	20
Rhinoclama Dall & Smith, 1886	221
rufum, Myrmecium, Latreille, 1824	44
sachalinensis, Mactra, Schrenk, 1862	122
saussurii, Panesthia, Wood-Mason, 1876	206
scabrior, Eurhinus, Kirby, 1819	50
Schantungia Lorenz, 1906 (Opinion 1261)	160
sculpta, Chelydra, Hay, 1916	226
segmentaria, Musca, Fabricius, 1805	109
semidiaphana, Mya, Rondani, 1850	106
Shangtungia Walcott, 1905 (Opinion 1261)	160
Shantungia Walcott, 1905 (Opinion 1261)	70, 160
sibiricus, Erinaceus, Erxleben, 1777 (Opinion 1243)	35
siliqua, Mya, Spengler, 1793	181
Somomya Bertoloni, 1861	106
Sphaeronassa Locard, 1886	239
spinifera, Shantungia, Walcott, 1905 (Opinion 1261)	160
Stethaspis Hope, 1837 (Opinion 1244)	37
stroemii, Cyclops, Baird, 1837	56
subspinosa, Crioceris, Fabricius, 1781	253
subtranslucida, Somomya, Bertolini, 1861	108
suturalis, Melolontha, Fabricius, 1775 (Opinion 1244)	37
sybillae, Mactra, Valenciennes, 1858	122
tabuensis, Rallus, Gmelin, 1789	249

	Page
tangeri, Gelasimus, Eydoux, 1835 (Opinion 1262)	200
TEIIDAE Gray, 1827	196
tenebricola, Linyphia, Wider, 1834 (Opinion 1245)	39
tentaculata, Caecilia, Linnaeus, 1758	124
teyou, Lacerta, Daudin, 1802	196
tisboides, Dactylopus, Claus, 1863	56
Tricelia Renier, [1807]	242
Trichaporus Foerster, 1856	73
Tylosteus Leidy, 1872	184
typica, Garzonia, Ameghino, 1891 (Opinion 1241)	29
uka, Cancer, Shaw & Nodder, 1803 (Opinion 1262)	200
Uroplata Chevrolat, 1835	62
UROPLATIIDAE Boulenger, 1884	62
Uroplatus Duméril, 1806	62
UROPLATINI Leng, 1920	62
variopedata, Tricelia, Renier [1807]	241
vicarius, Oeciacus, Horváth, 1912	65
viridis jamaicensis, Lacertus, Catesby, 1743	17
viridis, Teius, Merrem, 1820	196
viverrinus, Prototomus, Cope, 1874 (Opinion 1263)	202
wahlbergi, Emesa, Stål, 1855 (Opinion 1260)	157
wordiei, Prohysteroceras, Spath, 1922 (Opinion 1254)	94
wyomingensis, Troödon, Gilmore, 1931	184
Xantholinus Dejean, 1821 (Opinion 1250)	85
Zeugophora Kunze, 1818	252

CORRIGENDA

Vol. 39, part 3	
page 172, line 14	for 'Naumov, 1860' read 'Naumov, 1960'
Vol. 39, part 4	
page 236, line 4	for '*Tutzing, Switzerland*' read '*Tutzing, Germany*'
Vol. 40, part 1	
page 9, line 36	for 'Articles 67b(ii) . . . ' read 'Articles 67f(ii) . . .'
page 37, line 10	for 'Name Number 2133' read 'Name Number 2186'
page 51, line 4	for 'Kirby & Stephen' read 'Kirby & Spence'
page 51, line 34	for '. . . West Indies, the South America' read '. . . West Indies and South America'
Vol. 40, part 2	
page 83, line 24	Under Opinion 1249, for 'vol. 39, pp. 239–242' read 'vol. 35, pp. 239–242'
Vol. 40, part 3	
page 147, line 27	Under Opinion 1256, for 'vol. 36, pp. 125–126' read 'vol. 35, pp. 125–126'

PARTICULARS OF DATES OF PUBLICATION OF THE SEVERAL PARTS IN WHICH THE PRESENT VOLUME WAS PUBLISHED

Part No.	*Contents of Part (pages)*	*Date of Publication*
1	1–66	29 March 1983
2	67–128	15 July 1983
3	129–190	21 October 1983
4	191–266	30 December 1983

INSTRUCTIONS TO BINDER

The present volume should be bound up as follows:
1—266, T.P. I—VI.

Note: The wrappers (covers) of the four parts should be bound in at the end of the volume.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

VOLUME 40

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publication Office, c/o British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD
1983

(All rights reserved)

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

	Page
Officers and Members of the Commission	vii
Members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature	viii
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	191
Special Announcements	193

Comments

On the proposed designation of a type species for *Anolis* Daudin, 1802. J.M. Savage; A.F. Stimson & G.L. Underwood	195
On the proposed conservation of TEIIDAE Gray, 1827. A.F. Stimson; L.B. Holthuis	196
On the proposed conservation of *Dendrobates* Wagler, 1830 and DENDROBATIDAE Cope, 1865. L.B. Holthuis; A. Dubois	197

Opinions

Opinion 1262. *Cancer vocans major* Herbst, 1782 (Crustacea, Decapoda)	200
Opinion 1263. *Prototomus viverrinus* Cope, 1874 (Mammalia)	202

New and revived cases

Caeparia Stål, 1877 (Insecta, Dictyoptera). L.M. Roth & A.B. Gurney	205
Megilla Fabricius, 1805 and *Macropis* Klug, 1809 (Hymenoptera, Apoidea). C.D. Michener	207
Boiga Fitzinger, 1826 (Reptilia, Serpentes). J.B. Rasmussen & A.F. Stimson	209
Glossodoris Enrenberg, 1831, *Hypselodoris* Stimpson, 1855 and *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855 (Gastropoda, Opisthobranchia). W.B. Rudman	211
Rhinoclama Dall & Smith, 1886 (Mollusca, Septibranchia). D. Heppell & R. E. Morgan	221
Chelydra osceola Stejneger, 1918 (Reptilia, Testudines). H.M. Smith, R.B. Smith & D. Chiszar	225
Bainella Rennie, 1930 (Arthropoda, Trilobita). M.R. Cooper	228
Crinodes Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 and *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). D.S. Fletcher & I.W.B. Nye	231
NASSARIIDAE Iredale, 1916 (Gastropoda). D. Heppell	237
Tricelia variopedata Renier, [1807] (Polychaeta). The Secretary	241
Euphaedra Hübner, [1819] (Insecta, Lepidoptera). C.F. Cowan	243
Ourocnemis Baker, 1887 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). C.F. Cowan	245
Ceroplesis Serville, 1835 (Insecta, Coleoptera). R.C. Marinoni	248
Rallus tabuensis Gmelin, 1789 (Aves). M.D. Bruce, D.T. Holyoak & J.-C. Thibault	249
Zeugophora Kunze, 1818 (Insecta, Coleoptera). H. Silfverberg	252

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset